A U M

Universal Brotherhood is the union of diverse elements in one complete whole. Martanda, the mighty light of men, withholds no rays from the good or the evil, and why should man, who fades from view before Surya has revolved one cycle, keep back his love and help from any creature whatsoever?—*Old Hindu Book.*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. IV MAY, 1916 No. 7

No Theosophical Society, as such, is responsible for any opinion or declaration in this magazine, by whomsoever expressed, unless contained in an official document.

Where any article, or statement, has the author's name attached, he alone is responsible, and for those which are unsigned, the Editors will be accountable.

THE BHAGAVAD-GITA

CHAPTER IX.

Contributed by a Student of Wm. Q. Judge.
Chapter Eight was treated by this Student in THEOSOPHY of July, 1915.

THE title of the Ninth Chapter is "Devotion by Means of the Kingly Knowledge and the Kingly Mystery". The word "Kingly" means of course "the Highest", so that if the title had been written in our time, it would have read "The Highest Knowledge and the Deepest Mystery".

That any book or system of thought should purport to afford the means by which such universal knowledge may be gained, is a fact which demands the attention of every intelligent mind. A claim so great may not be lightly brushed aside as unworthy of deep consideration. Thinkers everywhere admit that what is needed in the world is a self-evidently true basis for thought and action; they realize that our sciences, philosophies and religions are attempts, more or less sincere, to obtain such a basis, but are being continually confronted with the fact that none of these supply a sure foundation for the peace, happiness and true progress of mankind. It is realized, for instance, that our modern modes of thought are based upon and applied to material existence and external appearances, all of these being the *effects* of unseen causes, and that where attempt is made to fathom the unseen, material existence is taken as the cause, and the unseen as the effect, with no perceptible gain in the direction of an understanding of Life or its purpose.

It is interesting to note that the modern basis of thought and action is the reverse of that of the ancient sages, and that whereas our ways of thinking leave us in the dark, the ways of the ancients throw a clear light upon all our problems. Let us therefore

study the wisdom of the past, that we may go forward with a clearer and more definite purpose than we now have.

In this chapter, Krishna addresses his disciple Arjuna in these terms: "Unto thee who findeth no fault, I will now make known this most mysterious knowledge, coupled with a realization of it, which having known thou shalt be delivered from evil." The words "Unto thee who findeth no fault" mean that Arjuna is recognized as one who understands that Law rules in everything and every circumstance, and that nothing can come to him of good or of evil, but that of which he himself was the cause; thus he accepted the good without exultation and the evil without complaint; in other words, Arjuna was equal-minded in pain or pleasure, joy or sorrow, and stood ready to suffer or enjoy whatever the Higher Self had in store for him by way of experience or discipline. Thus at the outset Krishna propounds and Arjuna accepts the rule of Law, as a necessary step towards further enlightenment.

The term "knowledge" as used here has a greater meaning than we are accustomed to give it; for we would esteem as "knowledge" an all-round acquaintance with religions, philosophies, arts, sciences and histories as so far recorded, together with that which our senses give us in regard to the external material world. It is generally held, for instance, that one cannot know the constituents or properties of a piece of stone, without mechanical or chemical aids applied directly to the object, and that nothing can be known of the thoughts or feelings of another unless expressed in words or acts; whereas, the knowledge spoken of by Krishna implies a full identification of the mind—or thinking power—, with whatever subject or object it may be directed to, which concentration enables the perceiver to cognize all the inherent qualities of the subject or object, as well as all incidental peculiarities, and know all about its nature.

The possibility of such "all-knowingness" is not admitted by the leaders of thought, and men of our day, whose process is based upon reasoning from particulars to universals, from effects to probable cause, and who are content to erect ever-changing hypotheses. Their process of reasoning is one, which although more refined and expanded, is the same as that used by our savage races. The sages of old, through experience gained from many civilizations, had learned to begin with universals—the plane of causation—and had finally come to see, understand and use the true process, after numberless testings and verifications. It is the result of this acquired wisdom that Krishna imparts to Arjuna as rapidly as his advancing intelligence will permit. It is this wisdom and its results that are portrayed in the Secret Doctrine—or Theosophy. So, if the student is to understand the Bhagavad-Gita, he must begin with universals and with the universal ever in mind expand into all particulars.

Take the opening sentence of the second paragraph of this chapter. "All this universe is pervaded by me in my invisible

form; all things exist in me, but I do not exist in them"; here Krishna speaks as the Omnipresent Spirit which is in all beings, but which is fully realized in such beings as Krishna, Christ, and others who have appeared in the world of men.

When Krishna uses the personal pronoun throughout the Gita, he is not referring to his own personality, but to the Self of All. So the above sentence may be read "All this universe is pervaded and sustained by the One Self—the Omnipresent Spirit; as it is the Self and Perceiver in all forms, it cannot be seen externally. Because of It, all forms exist, but It is not dependent upon form or forms; these are dependent upon It." In this sentence is contained an expression of the basic Universal Principle, the cause and sustainer of all what was, is, or ever shall be, and without which nothing exists. Being Universal or Omnipresent, and Infinite, no form of thought can define It; yet mankind has ever attempted to define the Infinite by their finite conceptions of Deity. Hence the many gods of different times and peoples; man-made idols every one of them, whether they be mental or physical. It is these man-made conceptions of Deity that have ever tended to erect and sustain divisions between peoples; tribal and national gods deny and frustrate a realization of Universal Brotherhood.

The ancient teaching which Krishna once more enunciates is that all forms of every kind proceed from One Universal Source; the life of each is hidden in and sustained by that Source—the One Life. The power to perceive and expand its range of perception and expression is the same in all beings and forms; the degrees of perception and expression are shown in the innumerable classes of beings; it is this power that is behind all evolution—the unfolding from within outwards.

Krishna goes on to present the Law under which all beings evolve, in the words, "O son of Kunti, at the end of a kalpa all things return unto my nature, and then again at the beginning of another kalpa, I cause them to evolve again". A kalpa means a great age or period, and the law referred to is what is spoken of in the Secret Doctrine as the Law of Periodicity, or the law of cycles. Everywhere in nature we find this law in operation, as in day and night, summer and winter, life and death, in-breathing and out-breathing, the systole and diastole of the heart, sowing and reaping. The general name for this universal Law is Karma, which means Action and Re-action, Cause and Effect; it applies to all beings and all planes. An ancient aphorism says, "There is no Karma unless there is a being to make it or feel its effect." Hence all manifestation is the result of karmic action by beings of every grade in their inter-action and inter-relation.

The phrase "I cause them to evolve again" carries with it the meaning that each period of manifestation, great or small, is followed by another on the basis of the experience gained. That which causes "them to evolve again" is the Self of All, which is also the self of each, or as it has been poetically called, "the Great

Breath" with its great periodical recurrent "out--breathings and in-breathings"; ceaseless pulsation may be said to be Its one attribute. It is this essential nature which is meant in the phrase "I emanate again and again this whole assemblage of beings, without their will, by the power of the material essence". "Without their will", may be understood by considering that no human being is in a body because he—as such—desired to be; nor does he leave his body because he desires to; the impelling force proceeds from the inner self, the real man. "By the power of the material essence" may be understood by considering the statement that Spirit and Matter are co-existent and co-eternal. By "matter" is meant primordial substance from which all differentiations in matter are produced by conscious actions of beings of different grades.

"I am as one who sitteth indifferent" means that the One Self is not involved in any or all forms of manifestation, but ever remains the spectator, the admonisher, the sustainer, the enjoyer, and also the highest soul. Just as each one may say, "I was in a child body and had experiences pertaining to that state; I passed through the changes of body and circumstance up to the present, and will pass through all changes to come, but I remain the same unchanging identity throughout all conditions."

"The deluded despise me in human form, being unacquainted with my real nature as Lord of all things". The One Self is the self of all beings. The Upanishads say that "the Self shines in all; but in all It does not shine forth." Krishna says that the deluded fail to recognize this Self, and judging from appearances and arbitrary classifications, maintain separateness. So acting, they set in motion causes that produce similar effects—in other words, bad karma.

The remainder of the chapter is devoted to presentations of the right understanding of Self and its results, as well as the results of a false or imperfect understanding.

Krishna's teaching throughout, emphasises the statement that there is but One Spirit and not several,—the same Spirit animating all beings and sustaining all. The same power to perceive is possessed by all alike. The differences in beings consist in the range of perception which has been acquired through evolution, and this applies to all lives below Man, to Man himself, and to all beings higher than Man. In "The Voice of the Silence" it is said that "Mind is like a mirror; it gathers dust while it reflects", and in other writings Mind is spoken of as "the mirror of the Soul". We cannot fail to see that we act in accordance with the ideas of life that we hold; that what we call "our mind" is a number of ideas held by us as a basis for thought and action; that we change ideas from time to time, as we find occasion for such change; but that at all times we act from the basis of ideas presently held. The reason for the differences between human beings is the false, imperfect or true ideas which form the basis of thought or action.

We are prone to accept and hold only such ideas as are in accord with our personal desires. Krishna presents an example of

what, among us, would be called a good desire, that of "those enlightened in the Vedas", whose desire is for a personal enjoyment of heaven; these, he says, obtain and enjoy that heaven for a period of time proportionate to their merits, and then they sink back to mortal birth. He concludes by saying "thus, those who long for the accomplishment of desires, following the Vedas, obtain a happiness which comes and goes. But for those who, thinking of me as identical with all, constantly worship me, I bear the burden of the responsibility of their happiness". The words "constantly worship me," have an explanation further on, in the chapter where he says, "Whatever thou doest, O Son of Kunti, whatever thou eatest, whatever thou sacrificest, whatever thou givest, whatever mortification thou performest, commit each unto me". The real "worship", is devotion to an ideal. Here "the Self of All" is the ideal, and the action indicated is to think and act for, and as, the One Self in all things, without self-interest in the results. We are not attached to results by our acts, but by our thoughts; freedom comes from a renunciation of self-interest in the fruit of actions.

All of the above is included in Krishna's closing injunction: "Having obtained this finite, joyless world, worship me. Serve me, fix heart and mind on me, be my servant, my adorer, prostrate thyself before me, and thus, united unto me, at rest, thou shalt go unto me".

Forum

MONSTERS OF DEPRAVITY*

Do monsters of depravity ever seek rebirth through any but mothers of like character?

W. Q. Judge.—I would like to answer this question so as to satisfy the questioner, but it being a question of statistics it is not possible to be exact from want of data. The question seems to bear the inference that the questioner thinks monsters of depravity seek mothers of like character. But is this so? Do we not know that all through time very bad men and women have been born of virtuous, righteous mothers? It was the mother's Karma to be so unfortunate. In Indian history there was a monster named Kansa born of a good mother; doubtless the mothers of Nero or other wicked Roman emperors were good women. All this being the case, we are at liberty to assume that sometimes monsters of depravity obtain birth through mothers of opposite character. If we were to insist on the opposite, then we must say, in the case of great sages and Avatars, such as Buddha, that they only seek birth through mothers who are great as they; but this is known not to be the case.

---

* This answer by Mr. Judge to the question asked was first printed in *The Theosophical Forum* of October, 1895. The title used is our own [ED. THEOSOPHY.]

Lucifer 4
32

THE ROOTS OF RITUALISM IN CHURCH AND MASONRY*

I.

THEOSOPHISTS are very often, and very unjustly too, accused of infidelity and even of Atheism. This is a grave error, especially with regard to the latter charge.

In a large society, composed of so many races and nationalities, in an association wherein every man and woman is left to believe in whatever he or she likes, and to follow or not to follow—just as they please—the religion they were born and brought up in, there is but little room left for Atheism. As for "infidelity," it becomes a misnomer and a fallacy. To show how absurd is the charge, in any case, it is sufficient to ask our traducers to point out to us, in the whole civilized world, that person who is *not* regarded as an "infidel" by some other person belonging to some different creed. Whether one moves in highly respectable and orthodox circles, or in a so-called heterodox "society," it is all the same. It is a mutual accusation, tacitly, if not openly, expressed; a kind of a mental game at shuttlecock and battledore flung reciprocally, and in polite silence, at each other's heads. In sober reality, then, no theosophist any more than a non-theosophist can be an infidel; while, on the other hand, there is no human being living who is not an infidel in the opinion of some sectarian or other. As to the charge of Atheism, it is quite another question.

What is *Atheism,* we ask, first of all? Is it disbelief in and denial of the existence of a God, or Gods, or simply the refusal to accept a personal deity on the somewhat gushy definition of R. Hall, who explains Atheism as "a ferocious system" because, "it leaves nothing *above* (?) us to excite awe, nor around us to awaken tenderness" (!) If the former, then most of our members—the hosts in India, Burmah, and elsewhere—would demur, as they believe in Gods and supernal beings, and are in great *awe* of some of them. Nor would a number of Western Theosophists fail to confess their full belief in Spirits, whether spatial or planetary, ghosts or angels. Many of us accept the existence of high and low Intelligences, and of Beings as great as any "personal" God. This is no occult secret. What we confessed to in the November LUCIFER (editorial), we reiterate again. Most of us believe in the survival of the Spiritual Ego, in Planetary Spirits and *Nirmanakayas,* those great Adepts of the past ages, who, renouncing their right to Nirvana, remain in our spheres of being, not as "spirits" but as complete spiritual human Beings. Save their corporeal, visible envelope, which they leave behind, they remain as they were, in order to help poor humanity, as far as can be done without sinning against Karmic law. This is the "Great Renunciation," indeed; an incessant, conscious self-sacrifice throughout æons and ages till that day when the eyes of blind mankind will open

* This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for March, 1889.

and, instead of the few, *all* will see the universal truth. These Beings may well be regarded as God and Gods—if they would but allow the fire in our hearts, at the thought of that purest of all sacrifices, to be fanned into the flame of adoration, or the smallest altar in their honour. But they will not. Verily, "the secret heart is fair Devotion's (only) temple," and any other, in this case, would be no better than profane ostentation.

Now with regard to other invisible Beings, some of whom are still higher, and others far lower on the scale of divine evolution. To the latter we will have nothing to say; the former will have nothing to say to us: for we are as good as non-existent for them. The homogeneous can take no cognizance of the heterogeneous; and unless we learn to shuffle off our mortal coil and commune with them "spirit to spirit," we can hardly hope to recognise their true nature. Moreover, every true Theosophist holds that the divine HIGHER SELF of every mortal man is of the same essence as the essence of these Gods. Being, moreover, endowed with free-will, hence having, more than they, responsibility, we regard the incarnated EGO as far superior to, if not more divine than, any spiritual INTELLIGENCE *still awaiting incarnation.* Philosophically, the reason for this is obvious, and every metaphysician of the Eastern school will understand it. The incarnated EGO has odds against it which do not exist in the case of a pure divine Essence unconnected with matter; the latter has no personal merit, whereas the former is on his way to final perfection through the trials of existence, of pain and suffering. The shadow of Karma does not fall upon that which is divine and unalloyed, and so different from us that no relation can exist between the two. As to those deities which are regarded in the Hindu esoteric Pantheon as finite and therefore under the sway of Karma, no true philosopher would ever worship them; they are signs and symbols.

Shall we then be regarded as atheists, only because while believing in Spiritual Hosts—those beings who have come to be worshipped in their collectivity as a *personal* God—we reject them absolutely as representing the ONE Unknown? and because we affirm that the eternal Principle, the ALL in ALL, or the *Absoluteness* of the *Totality,* cannot be expressed by limited words, nor be symbolised by anything with conditioned and qualificative attributes? Shall we, moreover, permit to pass without protest the charge against us of idolatry—by the Roman Catholics, of all men? They, whose religion is as pagan as any of the solar and element worshippers; whose creed was framed out for them, cut and dry, ages before the year I of Christian era; and whose dogmas and rites are the same as those of every *idolatrous* nation—if any such nation still exists in spirit anywhere at this day. Over the whole face of the earth, from the North to the South Pole, from the frozen gulfs of Northland to the torrid plains of Southern India, from Central America to Greece and Chaldea, the Solar Fire, as the symbol of divine Creative Power, of Life and Love, was worshipped. The union of the Sun (male element) with

Earth and the Water (matter, the female element) was celebrated in the temples of the whole Universe. If Pagans had a feast commemorative of this union—which they celebrated nine months ere the Winter Solstice, when Isis was said to have conceived—so have the Roman Catholic Christians. The great and *holy day* of the *Annunciation,* the day on which the Virgin Mary "found favour with (her) God" and conceived "the Son of the *Highest,*" is kept by Christians *nine months before Christmas.* Hence, the worship of the Fire, lights and lamps in the churches. Why? Because Vulcan, the fire-God, married Venus, the daughter of the Sea; that the Magi watched over the sacred fire in the East, and the Virgin-Vestals in the West. The Sun was the "Father;" Nature, the eternal Virgin-Mother: Osiris and Isis, Spirit-Matter, the latter worshipped under each of its three states by Pagan and Christian. Hence the Virgins—even in Japan—clothed with star-spangled blue, standing on the lunar crescent, as symbolical of female Nature (in her three elements of Air, Water, Earth); Fire or the male Sun, fecundating her yearly with his radiant beams (the "cloven tongues like as of fire" of the Holy Ghost).

In *Kalevala* the oldest epic Poem of the Finns, of the pre-Christian antiquity of which there remains no doubt in the minds of scholars, we read of the gods of Finland, the gods of air and water, of fire and the forest, of Heaven and the Earth. In the superb translation by J. M. Crawford, in Rune L (Vol. II.) the reader will find the whole legend of the Virgin Mary in

> "*Mariatta,* child of beauty,
> Virgin-Mother of the Northland. . ."

Ukko, the great Spirit, whose abode is in Yûmäla, the sky or Heaven, chooses the Virgin Mariatta as his vehicle to incarnate through her in a Man-God. She becomes pregnant by plucking and eating a red berry *(marja),* when, repudiated by her parents, she gives birth to a "Son immortal," in the *manger of a stable.* Then the "Holy Babe" disappears, and Mariatta is in search of him. She asks a star, "the guiding star of Northland," where her "holy baby lies hidden," but the star answers her angrily:—

> "If I knew, I would not tell thee;
> 'Tis thy child that me created,
> In the cold to shine for ever. . . ."

and tells the Virgin nothing. Nor will the golden moon help her, because, Mariatta's babe having created her, left her in the great sky:—

> "Here to wander in the darkness,
> All alone at eve to wander,
> Shining for the good of others. . . ."

It is only the "Silver Sun" who, taking pity upon the Virgin-Mother, tells her:—

> "Yonder is thy golden infant,
> There thy holy babe lies sleeping,
> Hidden to his belt in water,
> Hidden in the reeds and rushes."

She takes the holy baby home, and while the mother calls him "Flower,"

"Others named him *Son of Sorrow.*"

Is this a post-Christian legend? Not at all; for, as said, it is *essentially pagan in origin* and recognized as pre-Christian. Hence, with such data in hand in literature, the ever-recurring taunts of idolatry and atheism, of infidelity and paganism, ought to cease. The term *idolatry,* moreover, is of Christian origin. It was used by the early Nazarenes, during the 2½ centuries of our era, against those nations who used temples and churches, statues and images, because they, the early Christians themselves, *had neither temples, statues, nor images,* all of which they abhorred. Therefore the term "idolatrous" fits far better our accusers than ourselves, as this article will show. With Madonnas on every cross road, their thousands of statues, from Christs and Angels in every shape down to Popes and Saints, it is rather a dangerous thing for a Catholic to taunt any Hindu or Buddhist with idolatry. The assertion has now to be proved.

II.

We may begin by the origin of the word God. What is the real and primitive meaning of the term? Its meanings and etymologies are as many as they are various. One of them shows the word derived from an old Persian and mystic term *goda.* It means "itself," or something self-emanating from the absolute Principle. The root word was *godan*—whence Wodan, Woden, and Odin, the Oriental radical having been left almost unaltered by the Germanic races. Thus they made of it *gott,* from which the adjective *gut*—"good," as also the term *gotz,* or idol, were derived. In ancient Greece, the word Zeus and *Theos* led to the Latin *Deus.* This *goda,* the emanation, is not, and cannot be, identical with that from which it radiates, and is, therefore, but a periodical, finite manifestation. Old Aratus, who wrote "full of Zeus are all the streets and the markets of man; full of Him is the sea and the harbours," did not limit his deity to such a temporary reflection on our terrestrial plane as Zeus, or even its antetype—Dyaus, but meant, indeed, the universal, omnipresent Principle. Before the radiant god *Dyaus* (the sky) attracted the notice of man, there was the Vedic *Tad* ("that") which, to the Initiate and philosopher, would have no definite name, and which was the absolute Darkness that underlies every manifested radiancy. No more than the mythical Jupiter—the later reflection of Zeus—could Sûrya, the Sun, the first manifestation in the world of Maya and the Son of Dyaus, fail to be termed "Father" by the ignorant. Thus the Sun became very soon interchangeable and one with Dyaus; for some, the "Son," for others, the "Father" in the radiant sky; *Dyaus-Pitar,* the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Father, truly shows, however, his finite origin by having the Earth assigned to him as a wife. It is during the full decadence

of metaphysical philosophy that *Dyâva-prithivi* "Heaven and Earth" began to be represented as the Universal cosmic parents, not alone of men, but of the gods also. From the original conception, abstract and poetical, the ideal cause fell into grossness. Dyaus, the sky, became very soon Dyaus or Heaven, the abode of the "Father," and finally, indeed, that Father himself. Then the Sun, upon being made the symbol of the latter, received the title of *Dina-Kara* "day-maker," of *Bhaskara* "light-maker," now the Father of his Son, and *vice versa*. The reign of ritualism and of anthropomorphic cults was henceforth established and finally degraded the whole world, retaining supremacy to the present civilized age.

Such being the common origin, we have but to contrast the two deities—the god of the Gentiles and the god of the Jews—on their own *revealed* WORD; and judging them on their respective definitions of themselves, conclude intuitively which is the nearest to the grandest ideal. We quote Colonel Ingersoll, who brings Jehovah and Brahma parallel with each other. The former, "from the clouds and darkness of Sinai," said to the Jews:—

> "'Thou shalt have no other gods before me. . . . Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them nor serve them; for I, the Lord thy God, am a jealous God, *visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them* that hate me.' Contrast this with the words put by the Hindu into the mouth of Brahm: 'I am the same to all mankind. They who honestly serve other gods, involuntarily worship me. I am he who partaketh of all worship, and I am the reward of all worshippers.' Compare these passages. The first, a dungeon where crawl the things begot of jealous slime; the other, great as the domed firmament inlaid with suns. . . . ."

The "first" is the god who haunted Calvin's fancy, when he added to his doctrine of predestination that of Hell being paved with the skulls of *unbaptized* infants. The beliefs and dogmas of our churches are far more blasphemous in the ideas they imply than those of the *benighted* Heathen. The *amours* of Brahmâ, under the form of a buck, with his own daughter, as a deer, or of Jupiter with Leda, under that of a swan, are grand *allegories*. They were never given out as a *revelation*, but known to have been the products of the poetic fancy of Hesiod and other mythologists. Can we say as much of the *immaculate daughters* of the god of the Roman Catholic Church—Anna and Mary? Yet, even to breathe that the Gospel narratives are allegories too, as they would be most sacrilegious were they accepted in their dead letter, constitutes in a Christian born the *acme* of blasphemy!

Verily, they may whitewash and mask as much as they like the god of Abraham and Isaac, they shall never be able to disprove the assertion of Marcion, who denied that the God of *Hate* could be the same as the "Father of Jesus." Heresy or not, but the "Father in Heaven" of the Churches remained since then a hybrid creature; a mixture between the Jove of the Pagan mobs

and the "jealous God" of Moses, exoterically the SUN, whose abode is in Heaven, or the sky, esoterically. Does he not give birth to LIGHT "that shineth in Darkness," to the Day, the bright Dyaus, the Son, and is he not the MOST HIGH—*Deus Cœlum?* And is it not again *Terra*, the "Earth," the ever immaculate as the ever prolific Virgin who, fecundated by the ardent embraces of her "Lord"—the fructifying rays of the Sun, becomes, in this terrestrial sphere, the mother of all that lives and breathes on her vast bosom? Hence, the sacredness of her products in Ritualism —the *bread* and the *wine*. Hence also, the ancient *messis*, the great sacrifice to the goddess of harvest (*Ceres Eleusina*, the Earth again): messis, for the Initiates, *missa* for the profane,* now transformed into the Christian mass or liturgy. The ancient oblation of the fruits of the Earth to the Sun, the *Deus Aitissimus*, "the Most High," the symbol of the G. A. O. T. U. of the Masons to this day, became the foundation of the most important ritual among the ceremonies of the new religion. The worship offered to Osiris-Isis (the Sun and the Earth),[1] to Bel and the cruciform Astarte of the Babylonians; to Odin or Thor and Friga, of the Scandinavians; to Belen and the *Virgo Paritura* of the Celts; to Apollo and the *Magna Mater* of the Greeks; all these couples having the same meaning, passed bodily to, and were transformed by, the Christians into the Lord God or the Holy Ghost descending upon the Virgin Mary.

Deus Sol or *Solus*, the Father, was made interchangeable with the Son: the "Father" in his noon glory, he became the "Son" at Sun-rise, when he was said to "be born." This idea received its full apotheosis annually on December the 25th, during the Vernal Solstice, when the Sun—hence the solar gods of all the nations—was said to be born. *Natalis solis invicte*. And the "precursor" of the resurrecting Sun *grows*, and *waxes strong*, until the vernal equinox, when the god Sol begins its annual course, under the sign of the Ram or the *Lamb*, the first lunar week of the month. The 1st of March was feasted throughout all pagan Greece, as its *neomenia* was sacred to Diana. Christian nations celebrate their Easter, for the same reason, on the first Sunday that follows the full moon, at the Vernal Equinox. With the festivals of the Pagans, the canonicals of their priests and Hierophants were copied by Christendom. Will this be denied? In his "Life of Constantine" Eusebius confesses—thus saying, perhaps, the only truth he ever uttered in his life—that "in order to render Christianity *more attractive to the Gentiles, the priests* (of Christ) *adopted the exterior vestments and ornaments used in the pagan cult.*" He might have added "their rituals" and dogmas also.

---

* From *pro*, "before," and *fanum*, "the temple," *i. e.*, the non-initiates who stood before the fane, but dared not enter it.—(*Vide* the Works of Ragon.)

[1] The Earth, and the Moon, its parent, are interchangeable. Thus all the lunar goddesses were also the representative symbols of the Earth.—*Vide Secret Doctrine, Symbolism.*

III.

It is a matter of History—however unreliable the latter—for a number of facts preserved by ancient writers corroborate it, that Church Ritualism and Freemasonry have sprung from the same source, and developed hand in hand. But as Masonry, even with its errors and later innovations, was far nearer the truth than the Church, the latter began very soon her persecutions against it. Masonry was, in its origin, simply archaic Gnosticism, or early esoteric Christianity; Church Ritualism was, and *is, exoteric paganism,* pure and simple—*remodelled,* we do not say *reformed.* Read the works of Ragon, a Mason who forgot more than the Masons of to-day know. Study, collating them together, the casual but numerous statements made by Greek and Latin writers, many of whom were Initiates, most learned Neophytes and partakers of the Mysteries. Read finally the elaborate and venomous slanders of the Church Fathers against the Gnostics, the Mysteries and their Initiates—and you may end by unravelling the truth. It is a few philosophers who, driven by the political events of the day, tracked and persecuted by the fanatical Bishops of early Christianity—who had yet neither fixed ritual nor dogmas nor Church—it is these Pagans who founded the latter. Blending most ingeniously the truths of the Wisdom-religion with the exoteric fictions so dear to the ignorant mobs, it is they who laid the first foundations of ritualistic Churches and of the Lodges of modern Masonry. The latter fact was demonstrated by Ragon in his ANTÉ-OMNIÆ of the modern Liturgy compared with the ancient Mysteries, and showing the rituals conducted by the early Masons; the former may be ascertained by a like comparison of the Church canonicals, the sacred vessels, and the festivals of the Latin and other Churches, with those of the pagan nations. But Churches and Masonry have widely diverged since the days when both were one. If asked how a profane can know it, the answer comes: ancient and modern Freemasonry are an obligatory study with every Eastern Occultist.

Masonry, its paraphernalia and modern innovations (the Biblical Spirit in it especially) notwithstanding, does good both on the moral and physical planes—or did so, hardly ten years ago, at any rate.* It was a true *ecclesia* in the sense of fraternal union and mutual help, the only *religion* in the world, if we regard the term as derived from the word *religare*, "to bind" together, as it made all men belonging to it "brothers"—regardless of *race* and *faith.* Whether with the enormous wealth at its command it could not do far more than it does now, is no business of ours. We see no visible, crying evil from this institution, and no one yet, save the Roman Church, has ever been found to show that it did any harm. Can *Church* Christianity say as much? Let ecclesiastical

* Since the origin of Masonry, the split between the British and American Masons and the French "Grand Orient" of the "Widow's Sons" is the first one that has ever occurred. It bids fair to make of these two sections of Masonry a Masonic Protestant and a Roman Catholic Church, as far as regards ritualism and brotherly love, at all events.

and profane history answer the question. For one, it has divided the whole mankind into Cains and Abels; it has slaughtered millions in the name of her God—the Lord of *Hosts,* truly, the ferocious Jehovah Sabbaoth—and instead of giving an impetus to civilization, the favourite boast of her followers—it has retarded it during the long and weary Mediæval ages. It is only under the relentless assaults of science and the revolt of men trying to free themselves, that it began to lose ground and could no longer arrest enlightenment. Yet has it not softened, as claimed, the "barbarous spirit of Heathendom"? We say no, most emphatically. It is Churchianity with its *odium theologicum,* since it could no longer repress human progress, which infused its lethal spirit of intolerance, its ferocious selfishness, greediness, and cruelty into modern civilization under the mask of *cant* and meek Christianity. When were the Pagan Cæsars more bloodthirsty or more coolly cruel than are the modern Potentates and their armies? When did the millions of the Proletariat starve as they do now? When has mankind shed more tears and suffered than at present?

Yes; there was a day when the Church and Masonry were one. These were centuries of intense moral reaction, a transitional period of thought as heavy as a nightmare, an age of strife. Thus, when the creation of new ideals led to the apparent pulling down of the old fanes and the destruction of old idols, it ended in reality with the rebuilding of those temples out of the old materials, and the erection of the same idols under new names. It was a universal re-arrangement and whitewashing—but only skin deep. History will never be able to tell us—but tradition and judicious research do—how many semi-Hierophants and even high Initiates were forced to become renegades in order to ensure the survival of the secrets of Initiation. Prætextatus, pro-consul at Achaia, is credited with remarking in the IVth century of our era, that "to deprive the Greeks of the sacred mysteries *which bind together the whole mankind* was equivalent to depriving them of their life." The Initiates took perhaps the hint, and thus joining *nolens volens* the followers of the new faith, then becoming all domineering, acted accordingly. Some hellenized Jewish Gnostics did the same; and thus more than one "Clemens Alexandrinus"—a convert to all appearance, an ardent Neo-Platonist and the same philosophical *pagan* at heart—became the instructor of ignorant Christian Bishops. In short the convert *malgré lui* blended the two external mythologies, the old and the new, and while giving out the compound to the masses, kept the sacred truths for himself.

The kind of Christians they made may be inferred from the example of Synesius, the Neo-Platonist. What scholar is ignorant of the fact, or would presume to deny, that the favourite and devoted pupil of Hypatia—the virgin-philosopher, the martyr and victim of the infamous Cyril of Alexandria—had not even been baptised when first offered by the bishops of Egypt the Episcopalian See of the Ptolemaïd? Every student is aware that, when finally

baptised, after having accepted the office proffered, it was so *skin-deep* that he actually signed his consent only after his conditions had been complied with and his future privileges guaranteed. What the chief clause was, is curious. It was a *sine quâ non* condition that he was to be allowed to abstain from professing the (Christian) doctrines, that he, the new Bishop, did not believe in! Thus, although baptised and ordained in the degrees of deaconship, priesthood, and episcopate, he never separated himself from his wife, never gave up his Platonic philosophy, nor even his sport so strictly forbidden to every other bishop. This occurred as late as the Vth century.

Such transactions between initiated philosophers and ignorant priests of reformed Judaism were numerous in those days. The former sought to save their "mystery-vows" and personal dignity, and to do so they had to resort to a much-to-be-regretted compromise with ambition, ignorance, and the rising wave of popular fanaticism. They believed in Divine Unity, the ONE or *Solus*, unconditioned and unknowable; and still they consented to render public homage and pay reverence to *Sol*, the Sun moving among his twelve apostles, the 12 signs of the Zodiac, *alias* the 12 Sons of Jacob. The *hoi polloi* remaining ignorant of the former, worshipped the latter, and in them, their old time-honoured gods. To transfer that worship from the solar-lunar and other cosmic deities to the Thrones, Archangels, Dominions, and Saints was no difficult matter; the more so since the said sidereal dignities were received into the new Christian Canon with their old names almost unchanged. Thus, while, during Mass, the "Grand Elect" reiterated, under his breath, his absolute adherence to the Supreme Universal Unity of the "incomprehensible Workman," and pronounced in solemn and loud tones the "Sacred Word" (now substituted by the Masonic "Word at low breath"), his assistant proceeded with the chanting of the *Kyriel* of names of those inferior sidereal beings whom the masses were made to worship. To the profane catechumen, indeed, who had offered prayers but a few months or weeks before to the Bull Apis and the holy Cynocephalus, to the sacred ibis and the hawk-headed Osiris, St. John's eagle* and the divine

* It is an error to say that John the Evangelist became the patron Saint of Masonry only after the XVIth century, and it implies a double mistake. Between John the "Divine," the "Seer" and the writer of *Revelation*, and John the Evangelist who is now shown in company of the Eagle, there is a great difference, as the latter John is a creation of Irenæus, along with the fourth gospel. Both were the result of the quarrel of the Bishop of Lyons with the Gnostics, and no one will ever tell what was the real name of the writer of the grandest of the Evangels. But what we do know is, that the Eagle is the legal property of John, the author of the *Apocalypsis*, written originally centuries B. C., and only *re-edited*, before receiving canonical hospitality. This John, or *Oannes*, was the accepted patron of all the Egyptian and Greek Gnostics (who were the early Builders or *Masons* of "Solomon's Temple," as, earlier, of the Pyramids) from the beginning of time. The *Eagle* was his attribute, the most archaic of symbols—being the Egyptian *Ah*, the bird of Zeus, and sacred to the Sun with every ancient people. Even the Jews adopted it among the Initiated Kabalists, as "the symbol of the Sephirah Tiph-e-reth, the spiritual Æther or air," says Mr. Myer's "Qabbalah." With the Druids the eagle was the symbol of the Supreme Deity, and again a portion of the cherubic symbol. Adopted by the pre-Christian Gnostics, it could be seen at the foot of the *Tau* in Egypt, before it was placed in the Rose-Croix degree at the foot of the Christian cross. Pre-eminently the bird of the Sun, the Eagle is necessarily connected with every solar god, and is the symbol of every seer who looks into the astral light, and sees in it the shadows of the Past, Present, and Future, as easily as the Eagle looks at the Sun.

Dove (witness of the Baptism while hovering over the Lamb of God), must have appeared as the most natural development and sequence to his own national and sacred zoology, which he had been taught to worship since the day of his birth.

IV.

It may thus be shown that both modern Freemasonry and Church ritualism descend in direct line from initiated Gnostics, Neo-Platonists, and renegade Hierophants of the Pagan Mysteries, the secrets of which they have lost, but which have been nevertheless preserved by those who would not compromise. If both Church and Masons are willing to forget the history of their true origin, the theosophists are not. They repeat: Masonry and the three great Christian religions are all inherited goods. The "ceremonies and passwords" of the former, and the prayers, dogmas, and rites of the latter, are travestied copies of pure Paganism (copied and borrowed as diligently by the Jews), and of Neo-Platonic theosophy. Also, that the "passwords" used even now by Biblical Masons and connected with "the tribe of Judah," "Tubal-Cain," and other Zodiacal dignitaries of the Old Testament, are the Jewish *aliases* of the ancient gods of the heathen *mobs*, not of the gods of the Hierogrammatists, the interpreters of the *true* mysteries. That which follows proves it well. The good Masonic Brethren could hardly deny that in name they are *Solicoles* indeed, the worshippers of the Sun in heaven, in whom the erudite Ragon saw such a magnificent symbol of the G. A. O. T. U.—which it surely is. Only the trouble he had was to prove—which no one can—that the said G. A. O. T. U. was not rather the *Sol* of the small exoteric fry of the *Pro-fanes* than the *Solus* of the High *Epoptai*. For the secret of the fires of SOLUS, the spirit of which radiates in the "Blazing Star," is a Hermetic secret which, unless a Mason studies *true* theosophy, is lost to him for ever. He has ceased to understand now, even the little indiscretions of Tshuddi. To this day Masons and Christians keep the Sabbath sacred, and call it the "Lord's" day; yet they know as well as any that both *Sunday*, and the *Sonntag* of Protestant England and Germany, mean the Sun-day or the *day of the Sun*, as it meant 2,000 years ago.

And you, Reverend and good Fathers, Priests, Clergymen, and Bishops, you who so charitably call theosophy "idolatry" and doom its adherents openly and privately to eternal perdition, can you boast of one single rite, vestment, or sacred vessel in church or temple that does not come to you from paganism? Nay, to assert it would be too dangerous, in view, not only of history, but also of the confessions of your own priestly craft.

Let us recapitulate if only to justify our assertions.

"Roman sacrificators had to confess before sacrificing," writes du Choul. The priests of Jupiter donned a tall, square, black cap (*Vide* Armenian and Greek modern priests), the head dress of the *Flamines*. The black *soutane* of the Roman Catholic priest is the black *hieroceraces*, the loose robe of the

Mithraic priests, so-called from being *raven* coloured (raven, *corax*). The King-Priest of Babylon had a golden seal-ring and slippers kissed by the conquered potentates, a white mantle, a tiara of gold, to which two bandelets were suspended. The popes have the seal-ring and the slippers for the same use; a white satin mantle bordered with golden stars, a tiara with two bejewelled bandelets suspended to it, etc., etc. The white linen *alb* (*alba vestis*) is the garment of the priests of *Isis;* the top of the heads of the priests of Anubis was shaven (*Juvenal*), hence the tonsure; the *chasuble* of the Christian *"Father"* is the copy from the upper garment of the Phœnician priest-sacrificers, a garment called *calasiris,* tied at the neck and descending to their *heels.* The *stole* comes to our priests from the female garment worn by the *Galli,* the male—*Nautches* of the temple, whose office was that of the Jewish *Kadashim;* (*Vide* II. Kings xxiii. 7, for the true word) their *belt of purity* (?) from the *ephod* of the Jews, and the *Isiac* cord; the priests of Isis being vowed to chastity. (*Vide* Ragon, for details.)

The ancient pagans used *holy* water or lustrations to purify their cities, fields, temples, and men, just as it is being done now in Roman Catholic countries. Fonts stood at the door of every temple, full of lustral water and called *favisses* and *aquiminaria.* Before sacrificing, the pontiff or the *curion* (whence the French *curé*), dipping a laurel branch into the lustral water, sprinkled with it the pious congregation assembled, and that which was then termed *lustrica* and *aspergilium* is now called sprinkler (or *goupillon,* in French). The latter was with the priestesses of Mithra the symbol of the Universal *lingam.* Dipped during the Mysteries in lustral milk, the faithful were sprinkled with it. It was the emblem of Universal fecundity; hence the use of the holy water in Christianity, a rite of phallic origin. More than this; the idea underlying it is purely occult and belongs to ceremonial magic. Lustrations were performed by fire, sulphur, air, and water. To draw the attention of the celestial gods, *ablutions* were resorted to; to conjure the nether gods away, *aspersion* was used.

The vaulted ceilings of cathedrals and churches, Greek or Latin, are often painted blue and studded with golden stars, to represent the canopy of the heavens. This is copied from the Egyptian temples, where solar and star worship was performed. Again, the same reverence is paid in Christian and Masonic architecture to the Orient (or the Eastern point) as in the days of Paganism. Ragon described it fully in his destroyed volumes. The *princeps porta,* the door of the World, and of the "King of Glory," by whom was meant at first the Sun, and now his human symbol, the Christ, is the door of the Orient, and faces the East in every church and temple.* It is through this "door of life"—the solemn pathway, through which the daily entrance of the luminary into the *oblong square*[1] of the earth or the Tabernacle of

* Except, perhaps, the temples and chapels of dissident Protestants, which are built anywhere, and used for more than one purpose. In America I know of chapels hired for fairs and shows, and even theatres; to-day a chapel, the day after sold for debts, and fitted for a gin shop or a public house. I speak of chapels, of course, not of Churches and Cathedrals.

[1] A Masonic term; a symbol of the Arks of Noah, and of the Covenant, of the Temple of Solomon, the Tabernacle, and the Camp of the Israelites, all built as "oblong squares." Mercury and Apollo were represented by oblong cubes and squares, and so is Kaaba, the great temple at Mecca.

the Sun is effected every morning—that the "newly born" babe is ushered, and carried to the baptismal font; and it is to the left of this edifice (the gloomy north whither start the "apprentices," and where the candidates got their *trial by water*) that now the fonts, and in the days of old the well (*piscinas*) of lustral waters, were placed in the ancient churches, which had been pagan fanes. The altars of heathen Lutetia were buried, and found again under the choir of *Notre-Dame* of Paris, its ancient lustral wells existing to this day in the said Church. Almost every great ancient Church on the Continent that antedates the Middle Ages was once a pagan temple in virtue of the orders issued by the Bishops and Popes of Rome. Gregory the Great (Platine *en sa Vie*) commands the monk Augustine, his missionary in England, in this wise: "Destroy the idols, never the temples! Sprinkle them with holy water, place in them relics, and let the nations worship in the places they are accustomed to." We have but to turn to the works of Cardinal Baronius, to find in the year XXXVIth of his *Annals* his confession. The Holy Church, he says, was *permitted to appropriate the rites and ceremonies used by the pagans in their idolatrous cult,* since she (the Church) *expiated them by her consecration!* In the *Antiquités Gauloises* (Book II. Ch. 19) by Fauchet, we read that the Bishops of France adopted and *used the pagan ceremonies in order to convert followers to Christ.*

This was when Gaul was still a pagan country. Are the same rites and ceremonies used now in Christian France, and other Roman Catholic countries, still going on in grateful remembrance of the pagans and their gods?

V.

Up to the IVth century the churches knew of no altars. Up to that date the altar was a *table* raised in the middle of the temple, for purposes of *Communion,* or fraternal repasts (the *Cœna,* as mass was originally said in the evening). In the same way now the table is raised in the "Lodge" for Masonic Banquets, which usually close the proceedings of a Lodge and at which the resurrected Hiram Abifs, the "Widow's Sons," honour their toasts by *firing,* a Masonic mode of transubstantiation. Shall we call their banquet tables *altars,* also? Why not? The altars were copies from the *ara maxima* of pagan Rome. The Latins placed square and oblong stones near their tombs, and called them *ara,* altar; they were consecrated to the gods *Lares* and *Manes.* Our altars are a derivation from these square stones, another form of the boundary stones known as the gods *Termini*—the Hermeses, and the Mercuries, whence *Mercurius quadratus, quadriceps, quadrifrons,* etc., etc., the *four-faced* gods, whose symbols these square stones were, from the highest antiquity. The stone on which the ancient kings of Ireland were crowned was such an "altar." Such a stone is in Westminster Abbey, endowed, moreover, with a voice.

Thus our altars and thrones descend directly from the priapic boundary stones of the pagans—the gods *termini*.

Shall the church-going reader feel very indignant if he is told that the Christians adopted the *pagan* way of worshipping *in a temple*, only during the reign of Diocletianus? Up to that period they had an insurmountable horror for altars and temples, and held them in abomination for the first 250 years of our era. These primitive Christians were Christians indeed; the moderns are more pagan than any ancient idolators. The former were the *Theosophists* of those days; from IVth century they became Helleno-Judaic Gentiles *minus* the philosophy of the Neo-Platonists. Read what Minutius Felix says in the IIIrd century to the Romans:—

> "You fancy that we (Christians) conceal that which we worship because *we will have neither temples nor altars?* But what image of God shall we raise, since Man is himself God's image? What temple can we buiid to the Deity, when the Universe, which is Its work, can hardly contain It? How shall we enthrone the power of such Omnipotence in a single building? Is it not far better to consecrate to the Deity a temple in our heart and spirit?"

But then the *Chres*tians of the type of Minutius Felix had in their mind the commandment of the MASTER-INITIATE, *not to pray in the synagogues and temples* as the *hypocrites* do, "that they may be seen of men." (Matthew vi., 5). They remembered the declaration of Paul, the Apostle-Initiate, the "Master Builder" (I Corinthians iii., 10), that MAN was the one temple of God, in which the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of God, dwelleth; (*Ibid.*) They obeyed the truly Christian precepts, whereas the modern Christians obey but the arbitrary canons of their respective churches, and the rules of their Elders. "Theosophists are notorious Atheists," exclaims a writer in the "Church Chronicle." "Not one of them is ever known to attend divine service . . . . the Church is obnoxious to them"; and forthwith uncorking the vials of his wrath, he pours out their contents on the *infidel, heathen* F. T. S. The modern Churchman stones the Theosophist as his ancient forefather, the Pharisee of the "Synagogue of the Libertines" (*Acts* vi, 9) stoned Stephen, for saying that which even many Christian Theosophists say, namely that "the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands" (*Ibid.* 48); and they "suborn men" just as these iniquitous judges did (*Ibid.* II) to testify against us.

Forsooth, friends, you are indeed the righteous descendants of your predecessors, whether of the colleagues of Saul, or of those of Pope Leo X., the cynical author of the ever famous sentence: "How useful to us this *fable* of Christ," *"Quantum nobis prodest hac fabula Christi!"*

VI.

The "Solar Myth" theory has become in our day stale—*ad nauseam*—repeated as we hear it from the four cardinal points of

Orientalism and Symbolism, and applied indiscriminately to all things and all religions, except Church Christianity and state-religion. No doubt the Sun was throughout the whole antiquity and since days immemorial the symbol of the Creative Deity—with every nation, not with the Parsis alone; but so he is with the Ritualists. As in days of old, so it is now. Our central star is the "Father" for the *pro-fanes,* the Son of the ever unknowable Deity for the *Epoptai.* Says the same Mason, Ragon, "the Sun was the most sublime and natural image of the GREAT ARCHITECT, as the most ingenious of all the allegories under which the moral and good man (the *true sage*) had ever endowed infinite and limitless *Intelligence.*" Apart from the latter assumption, Ragon is right; for he shows this symbol gradually receding from the ideal so represented and conceived, and becoming finally from a symbol the original, in the minds of his ignorant worshippers. Then the great Masonic author proves that it is the *physical* Sun which was regarded as both the Father and the Son by the early Christians.

"Oh, initiated Brethren," he exclaims. "Can you forget that in the temples of the existing religion a large *lamp* burns night and day? It is suspended in front of the chief altar, the depository of the ark of the Sun. Another *lamp* burning before the altar of the virgin-mother is the emblem of the light of the *moon.* Clemens Alexandrinus tells us that the Egyptians were the first to establish the religious use of the lamps. . . . Who does not know that the most sacred and terrible duty was entrusted to the Vestals? If the Masonic temples are lighted with three astral lights, the *sun,* the *moon,* and the *geometrical star,* and with three vital lights, this Hierophant and his two *Episcopes* (Wardens, in French *Surveillants*), it is because one of the Fathers of Masonry, the learned Pythagoras, ingenuously suggests that we should not speak of divine things without a light. Pagans celebrated a festival of lamps called *Lampadophorics* in honour of Minerva, Prometheus, and Vulcan. But Lactantius and some of the earliest fathers of the new faith complained bitterly of this pagan introduction of lamps in the Churches; 'If they deigned,' writes Lactantius, *'to contemplate that light which we call the* SUN, they would soon recognise that *God has no need of their lamps.'* And Vigilantius adds: 'Under the pretext of religion the Church established a Gentile custom of lighting vile candles, while the SUN is there illuminating us with a thousand lights. *Is it not a great honour* for the LAMB OF GOD (the sun thus represented), *which placed in the middle of the throne* (the Universe) *fills it with the radiance of his Majesty?'* Such passages prove to us that in those days the primitive Church worshipped THE GREAT ARCHITECT OF THE WORLD in its image the SUN, sole of its kind." (*The Mass and its Mysteries,* pp. 19 and 20.)

Indeed, while Christian candidates have to pronounce the Masonic oath turned to the East and that their "Venerable" keeps in the Eastern corner, because the Neophytes were made to do the same during the Pagan Mysteries, the Church has, in her turn, preserved the identical rite. During the High Mass, the High-Altar *(ara maxima)* is ornamented with the Tabernacle, or the pyx (the box in which the Host is kept), and with six lighted tapers. The esoteric meaning of the pyx and contents—the symbol of the Christ-Sun—is that it represents the resplendent luminary, and the six tapers the six planets (the early Christians

knowing of no more), three on his right and three on his left. This is a copy of the seven-branched candlestick of the synagogue, which has an identical meaning. *"Sol est Dominus Meus"* "the Sun is my Lord!" exclaims David in Psalm xcv. translated very ingeniously in the authorized version by "The Lord is a great God," "a great King *above* all Gods" (v. 3), or planets truly! Augustin Chalis is more sincere in his *Philosophie des Religions Compareés* (Vol. II., p. 18), when he writes:

> "All are devs (demons), on this Earth, save the God of the Seers (Initiates) the sublime IAO; and *if in Christ you see aught than* the SUN, then you adore a *dev*, a phantom such as are all the children of night."

The East being the cardinal point whence arises the luminary of the Day, the great giver and sustainer of life, the creator of all that lives and breathes on this globe, what wonder if all the nations of the Earth worshipped in him the visible agent of the invisible Principle and Cause; and that *mass* should be said in the honour of him who is the giver of *messis* of "harvest." But, between worshipping the ideal as a *whole*, and the physical symbol, a part chosen to represent that whole and the ALL, there is an abyss. For the learned Egyptian, the Sun was the "eye" of Osiris, not Osiris himself; the same for the learned Zoroastrians. For the early Christians the Sun became *the* Deity, *in toto;* and by dint of casuistics, sophistry, and dogmas not to be questioned, the modern Christian churches have contrived to force even the educated world to accept the same, while hypnotising it into a belief that *their* god is the one living true Deity, the maker of, *not the Sun* —a demon worshipped by the "heathen." But what may be the difference between a wicked demon, and the anthropomorphic God, *e. g.*, as represented in Solomon's Proverbs? That "God," unless poor, helpless, ignorant men call upon him, when their "fear cometh as desolation" and their "destruction as a whirlwind," threatens them in such words as these: "I will *laugh* at your calamities, I will *mock* when your fear cometh!" (Prov. i., 27.) Identify this God with the great Avatar on whom the Christian legend is hung; make him one with that true Initiate who said, "Blessed are they that mourn; for they shall be comforted": and what is the result? Such identification alone is quite sufficient to justify the fiendish joy of Tertullian, who laughed and rejoiced at the idea of his *infidel* next of kin roasting in hell-fire; the advice of Hieronymus to the Christian convert to trample over the body of his pagan mother, if she seeks to prevent him *leaving her for ever* to follow Christ; and it makes of all the Church tyrants, murderers, and *omnes gentes* of the Inquisition, the grandest and noblest exemplars of *practical* Christianity that have ever lived!

H. P. B.

OLD HINDOO SHIPS*

SOME twenty-five years ago two ocean steamships came into collision off the coast of Newfoundland; one sank with all on board, the other was saved in consequence of having the hull divided by iron bulkheads into water-tight compartments. Though the bottom was crushed in the water, it would only fill the compartment where the break was, and so the steamship came safely to port. This then novel improvement in the art of ship-building was brought into such conspicuous notice by that occurrence, and its merits were so palpable, that from that time steamships have been almost universally built with water-tight bulkheads.

Like most other supposed "modern" inventions, this was known to the ancient Hindus; and in quoting what follows from the narrative of the famous—now respected and credited—Venetian traveller of the thirteenth century, Ser Marco Polo,[1] we express the hope that this may serve as one more inducement to young India to respect their ancestors according to their deserts:—

"Some ships of the larger class have, besides (the cabins), to the number of thirteen bulkheads or divisions in the hold, formed of thick planks let into each other *(incastrati,* mortised or rabbeted). The object of these is to guard against accidents which may occasion the vessel to spring a leak, such as striking on a rock or receiving a stroke from a whale, a circumstance that not unfrequently occurs; for, when sailing at night, the motion through the waves caused a white foam that attracts the notice of the hungry animal. In expectation of meeting with food, it rushes violently to the spot, strikes the ship, and often forces in some part of the bottom. The water, running in at the place where the injury has been sustained, makes its way to the well which is always kept clear. The crew, upon discovering the situation of the leak, immediately remove the goods from the division affected by the water, which, in consequence of the boards being so well fitted, cannot pass from one division to another. They then repair the damage, and return the goods to the place in the hold from whence they had been taken. The ships are all double-planked; that is, they have a course of sheathing-boards laid over the planking in every part. These are caulked with oakum both withinside and without, and are fastened with iron nails. They are not coated with pitch, as the country does not produce that article, but the bottoms are smeared over with the following preparations:—The people take quick-lime and hemp, which latter they cut small, and with these, when pounded together, they mix oil procured from a certain tree, making of the whole a kind of unguent, which retains its viscous property more firmly, and is a better material than pitch."

---

*This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Theosophist* for November, 1881.

[1] *The Travels of Marco Polo, the Venetian.* Edited by Thomas Wright, Esq., M.A., F.S.A., etc., Corresponding Member of the Institute of France. London, 1854.

CROSS AND FIRE*

PERHAPS the most widespread and universal among the symbols in the old astronomical systems, which have passed down the stream of time to our century, and have left traces everywhere in the Christian religion as elsewhere,—are the Cross and the Fire—the latter, the emblem of the Sun. The ancient Aryans had them both as the symbols of Agni. Whenever the ancient Hindu devotee desired to worship Agni—says E. Burnouf (*Science des Religions*, c. 10)—he arranged two pieces of wood in the form of a cross, and, by a peculiar whirling and friction obtained fire for his sacrifice. As a symbol, it is called *Swastica,* and, as an instrument manufactured out of a sacred tree and in possession of every Brahmin, it is known as *Arani.*

The Scandinavians had the same sign and called it Thor's Hammer, as bearing a mysterious magneto-electric relation to Thor, the god of thunder, who, like Jupiter armed with his thunderbolts, holds likewise in his hand this ensign of power, over not only mortals but also the mischievous spirits of the elements, over which he presides. In Masonry it appears in the form of the grand master's mallet; at Allahabad it may be seen on the Fort as the Jaina Cross, or the Talisman of the Jaina Kings; and the gavel of the modern judge is no more than this *crux dissimulata*—as de Rossi, the archæologist calls it; for the gavel is the sign of power and strength, as the hammer represented the might of Thor, who, in the Norse legends splits a rock with it, and kills Medgar. Dr. Schliemann found it in *terra cotta* disks, on the site, as he believes, of ancient Troy, in the lowest strata of his excavations; which indicated, according to Dr. Lundy, "an Aryan civilization long anterior to the Greek—say from two to three thousand years B. C." Burnouf calls it the oldest form of the cross known, and affirms that it is found personified in the ancient religion of the Greeks under the figure of Prometheus 'the fire-bearer,' crucified on mount Caucasus, while the celestial bird—the *Cyena* of the Vedic hymns,—daily devours his entrails. Boldetti, (*Osservazioni* I., 15, p. 60) gives a copy from the painting in the cemetery of St. Sebastian, representing a Christian convert and grave-digger, named Diogenes, who wears on both his legs and right arm the signs of the *Swastica.* The Mexicans and the Peruvians had it, and it is found as the sacred Tau in the oldest tombs of Egypt.

It is, to say the least, a strange coincidence, remarked even by some Christian clergymen, that *Agnus Dei,* the Lamb of God, should have the symbols, identical with the Hindu God Agni. While *Agnus Dei* expiates and takes away the sins of the world, in one religion, the God *Agni,* in the other, likewise expiates sins against the gods, man, the manes, the soul, and repeated sins; as

---

* This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Theosophist* for November, 1879.

shown in the six prayers accompanied by six oblations. (Colebrooke—*Essays*, Vol. I, p. 190.)

If, then, we find these two—the Cross and the Fire—so closely associated in the esoteric symbolism of nearly every nation, it is because on the combined powers of the two rests the whole plan of the universal laws. In astronomy, physics, chemistry, in the whole range of natural philosophy, in short, they always come out as the invisible cause and the visible result; and only metaphysics and alchemy—or shall we say *Metachemistry*, since we prefer coining a new word to shocking sceptical ears?—can fully and conclusively solve the mysterious meaning. An instance or two will suffice for those who are willing to think over hints.

The Central Point, or the great central sun of the Kosmos, as the Kabalists call it, is the Deity. It is the point of intersection between the two great conflicting powers—the centripetal and centrifugal forces, which drive the planets into their elliptical orbits, that make them trace a cross in their paths through the Zodiac. These two terrible, though as yet hypothetical and imaginary powers, preserve harmony and keep the Universe in steady, unceasing motion; and the four bent points of the Swastica typify the revolution of the Earth upon its axis. Plato calls the Universe a "blessed god" *which was made in a circle and decussated in the form of the letter X*. So much for astronomy. In Masonry the Royal Arch degree retains the cross as the triple Egyptian Tau. It is the mundane circle with the astronomical cross upon it rapidly revolving; the perfect square of the Pythagorean mathematics in the scale of numbers, as its occult meaning is interpreted by Cornelius Agrippa. Fire is heat,—the central point; the perpendicular ray represents the male element or spirit; and the horizontal one the female element—or matter. Spirit vivifies and fructifies the matter, and everything proceeds from the central point, the focus of Life, and Light, and Heat, represented by the terrestrial fire. So much, again, for physics and chemistry, for the field of analogies is boundless, and Universal Laws are immutable and identical in their outward and inward applications. Without intending to be disrespectful to any one, or to wander far away from truth, we think we may say that there are strong reasons to believe that in their original sense the Christian Cross—as the cause, and Eternal torment by Hell Fire—as the direct effect of negation of the former—have more to do with these two ancient symbols than our Western theologians are prepared to admit. If Fire is the Deity with some heathens, so in the Bible, God is likewise the Life and the Light of the World; if the Holy Ghost and Fire cleanse and purify the Christian, on the other hand Lucifer is also Light, and called the "Son of the morning star."

Turn wherever we will, we are sure to find these conjoint relics of ancient worship with almost every nation and people. From the Aryans, the Chaldeans, the Zoroastrians, Peruvians, Mexicans, Scandinavians, Celts, and ancient Greeks and Latins, it

has descended in its completeness to the modern Parsi. The Phœnician Cabiri and the Greek Dioscuri are partially revived in every temple. cathedral, and village church; while, as will now be shown, the Christian Bulgarians have even preserved the sun worship in full.

It is more than a thousand years since this people, who, emerging from obscurity, suddenly became famous through the late Russo-Turkish war, were converted to Christianity. And yet they appear none the less pagans than they were before, for this is how they meet Christmas and the New Year's day. To this time they call this festival Sourjvaki, as it falls in with the festival in honour of the ancient Slavonian god Sourja. In the Slavonian mythology this deity—Sourja or Sourva,—evidently identical with the Aryan *Surya* . . . sun . . . is the god of heat, fertility, and abundance. The celebration of this festival is of an immense antiquity, as, far before the days of Christianity, the Bulgarians worshipped Sourva, and consecrated New Year's day to this god, praying him to bless their fields with fertility, and send them happiness and prosperity. This custom has remained among them in all its primitive heathenism, and though it varies according to localities, yet the rites and ceremonies are essentially the same.

On the eve of New Year's day the Bulgarians do no work and are obliged to fast. Young betrothed maidens are busy preparing a large *platiy* (cake) in which they place roots and young shoots of various forms, to each of which a name is given according to the shape of the root. Thus, one means the "house," another represents the "garden"; others again, the mill, the vineyard, the horse, a cat, a hen, and so on, according to the landed property and worldly possessions of the family. Even articles of value such as jewellery and bags of money are represented in this emblem of the horn of abundance. Besides all these, a large and ancient silver coin is placed inside the cake; it is called *bábka* and is tied two ways with a red thread, which forms a cross. This coin is regarded as the symbol of fortune.

After sunset, and other ceremonies, including prayers addressed in the direction of the departing luminary, the whole family assemble about a large round table called *paralyà*, on which are placed the above-mentioned cake, dry vegetables, corn, wax taper, and, finally, a large censer containing incense of the best quality to perfume the god. The head of the household, usually the oldest in the family—either the grandfather, or the father himself—taking up the censer with the greatest veneration, in one hand, and the wax taper in the other, begins walking about the premises, incensing the four corners, beginning and ending with the East; and reads various invocations, which close with the Christian "Our Father who art in Heaven," addressed to Sourja. The taper is then laid away to be preserved throughout the whole year, till the next festival. It is thought to have acquired marvellous healing

properties, and is lighted only upon occasions of family sickness, in which case it is expected to cure the patient.

After this ceremony, the old man takes his knife and cuts the cake into as many slices as there are members of the household present. Each person, upon receiving his or her share, makes haste to open and search the piece. The happiest of the lot, for the ensuing year, is he or she who gets the part containing the old coin crossed with the scarlet thread; he is considered the elect of Sourja, and every one envies the fortunate possessor. Then in order of importance come the emblems of the house, the vineyard, and so on; and according to his finding, the finder reads his horoscope for the coming year. Most unlucky he who gets the cat; he turns pale and trembles. Woe to him and misery, for he is surrounded by enemies, and has to prepare for great trials.

At the same time, a large log which represents a flaming altar, is set up in the chimney-place, and fire is applied to it. This log burns in honour of Sourja and is intended as an oracle for the whole house. If it burns the whole night through till morning without the flame dying out, it is a good sign; otherwise, the family prepares to see death that year, and deep lamentations end the festival.

Neither the *momtzee* (young bachelor), nor the *mommee* (the maiden), sleep that night. At midnight begins a series of soothsaying, magic, and various rites, in which the burning log plays the part of the oracle. A young bud thrown into the fire and bursting with a loud snap, is a sign of happy and speedy marriage, and *vice versa*. Long after midnight, the young couples leave their respective homes, and begin visiting their acquaintances, from house to house, offering and receiving congratulations, and rendering thanks to the deity. These deputy couples are called the *Souryakari,* and each male carries a large branch ornamented with red ribbons, old coins, and the image of Sourja, and as they wend along sing in chorus. Their chant is as original as it is peculiar and merits translation, though, of course, it must lose in being rendered into a foreign language. The following stanzas are addressed by them to those they visit:—

Sôurvá, Soúrva, Lord of the Season,
Happy New Year mayst thou send;
Health and fortune on this household,
Success and blessings till next year.

With good crops and full ears,
With gold and silk, and grapes and fruits;
With barrels full of wine, and stomachs full,
You and your house be blessed by the God . . .
His blessing on you all.—Amen! Amen! Amen!

The singing Souryakari, recompensed for their good wishes with a present at every house, go home at early dawn. . . . And this is how the symbolical exoteric Cross and Fire worship of old Aryavart go hand in hand in Christian Bulgaria. . . .

A WEIRD TALE*

THE readers of this magazine have read in its pages, narratives far more curious and taxing to belief than the one I am about to give fragments of. The extraordinary Russian tale of the adept at the rich man's castle when the infant assumed the appearance of an old man will not be forgotten. But the present tale, while not in the writer's opinion containing anything extremely new, differs from many others in that I shall relate some things, I myself saw. At this time too, the relation is not inopportune, and perhaps some things here set down may become, for many, explanations of various curious occurrences during the past five years in India and Europe.

To begin with, this partial story is written in accordance with a direction received from a source which I cannot disobey and in that alone must possess interest, because we are led to speculate why it is needed now.

Nearly all of my friends in India and Europe are aware that I have travelled often to the northern part of the South American continent and also to Mexico. That fact has been indeed noticed in this magazine. One very warm day in July 1881, I was standing at the vestibule of the Church of St. Theresa in the City of Caracas, Venezuela. This town was settled by the Spaniards who invaded Peru and Mexico and contains a Spanish-speaking people. A great crowd of people were at the door and just then a procession emerged with a small boy running ahead and clapping a loud clapper to frighten away the devil. As I noticed this, a voice in English said to me "curious that they have preserved that singular ancient custom." Turning I saw a remarkable looking old man who smiled peculiarly and said, "come with me and have a talk." I complied and he soon led me to a house which I had often noticed, over the door being a curious old Spanish tablet devoting the place to the patronage of St. Joseph and Mary. On his invitation I entered and at once saw that here was not an ordinary Carácas house. Instead of lazy dirty Venezuelan servants, there were only clean Hindoos, such as I had often seen in the neighbouring English Island of Trinidad; in the place of the disagreeable fumes of garlic and other things usual in the town, there hung in the air the delightful perfumes known only to the Easterns. So I at once concluded that I had come across a delightful adventure.

Seating ourselves in a room hung with tapestry and cooled by waving punkahs that evidently had not been long put up, we engaged in conversation. I tried to find out who this man was, but he evaded me. Although he would not admit or deny knowledge of the Theosophical Society or of Madame Blavatsky or of the Mahatmas, he constantly made such references that I was sure he knew all about them and had approached me at the church de-

*This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Theosophist* for July, 1885.

signedly. After quite a long talk during which I saw he was watching me and felt the influence of his eye, he said that he had liberty to explain a little as we had become sufficiently acquainted. It was not pleasure nor profit that called him there, but duty alone. I referred to the subterranean passages said to exist in Peru full of treasure and then he said the story was true and his presence there connected with it. Those passages extended up from Peru as far as Carácas where we then were. In Peru they were hidden and obstructed beyond man's power to get them; but in this place the entrances were not as well guarded although in 1812 an awful earthquake had levelled much of the town. The Venezuelans were rapacious and these men in India who knew the secret had sent him there to prevent any one finding the entrances. At certain seasons only there were possibilities of discovery; the seasons over he could depart in security, as until the period came again no one could find the openings without the help and consent of the adepts. Just then a curious bell sound broke on the air and he begged me to remain until he returned, as he was called, and then left the room. I waited a long time filled with speculations, and as it was getting late and past dinner hour I was about to leave. Just as I did so a Hindoo servant quickly entered and stood in front of the only door. As he stood there I heard a voice say as if through a long pipe: "Stir not yet." Reseating myself, I saw that on the wall, where I had not before noticed it, hung a curious broad silver plate brightly shining. The hour of the day had come when the sun's light struck this plate and I saw that on it were figures which I could not decipher. Accidentally looking at the opposite wall, I saw that the plate threw a reflection there upon a surface evidently prepared for that purpose and there was reproduced the whole surface of the plate. It was a diagram with compass, sign and curious marks. I went closer to examine, but just at that moment the sun dipped behind the houses and the figures were lost. All I could make out was that the letters looked like exaggerated Tamil or Telugu—perhaps Zend. Another faint bell sounded and the old man returned. He apologized, saying he had been far away, but that we would meet again. I asked where, and he said, "In London." Promising to return I hurried away. Next day I could not find him at all and discovered that there were two houses devoted to Joseph and Mary and I could not tell which I had seen him in. But in each I found Spaniards, Spanish servants and Spanish smells.

In 1884 I went to London and had forgotten the adventure. One day I strolled into an old alley to examine the old Roman wall in the Strand which is said to be 2,000 years old. As I entered and gazed at the work, I perceived a man of foreign aspect there who looked at me as I entered. I felt as if he knew me or that I had met him, but was utterly unable to be sure. His eyes did not seem to belong to his body and his appearance was at once startling and attractive. He spoke to the attendant, but his voice did not

help me. Then the attendant went out and he approaching me, said:

"Have you forgotten the house of Joseph and Mary?" In a moment I knew the expression that looked out through those windows of the soul, but still this was not the same man. Determined to give him no satisfaction I simply said, "no," and waited.

"Did you succeed in making out the reflection from the silver plate on the wall?" Here was complete identification of place, but not of person.

"Well," I said, "I saw your eyes in Carácas but not your "body." He then laughed and said, "I forgot that, I am the same "man, but I have borrowed this body for the present and must in- "deed use it for some time, but I find it pretty hard work to control "it. It is not quite to my liking. The expression of my eyes ot "course you knew, but I lost sight of the fact that you looked at "the body with ordinary eyes."

Once more I accompanied him to his residence and when not thinking of his person but only listening with the soul, I forgot the change. Yet it was ever present, and he kindly gave me an account of some things connected with himself, of absorbing interest. He began in this way.

"I was allowing myself to deceive myself, forgetting the Baga- "vat Gita where it tells us, that a man is his soul's friend and his "soul's enemy, in that retreat in Northern India where I had spent "many years. But the chance again arose to retrieve the loss in- "curred by that and I was given the choice of assuming this body."

At this point again I heard the signal bell and he again left me. When he returned, he resumed the story.

If I can soon again get the opportunity, I will describe that scene, but for the present must here take a halt.

(*To be continued.*) W. Q. J.

EXISTENCE OF MAHATMAS*

WE have received many inquiries, growing out of the conversation on the above subject between Edwin Arnold and the High Priest of Ceylon, and therefore we select the following one, which well represents the rest, together with the answer to it:

To JULIUS:—

Edwin Arnold, in "India Revisited," relates a conversation which took place in Ceylon between himself and one of the celebrated Buddhist pundits, or teachers of the Island, in which the pundit replies to Arnold's question—"Are there any Mahatmas or men of exalted wisdom and goodness positively known to you to be in existence?"—substantially as follows: "No. You may look for

*This article was first printed by Wm. Q. Judge in *The Path* for June, 1887.

them in India, you may seek them in Thibet or in China, or in Ceylon, but you will not find them, as no such men exist."

In view of the teachings of the Theosophical Society, I cannot account for the reply of the Buddhist. Will you please enlighten me?

C. F. B.

DEAR SIR:—

In reply to your inquiry concerning the answer made to Edwin Arnold, I would say:

1st. That I do not attempt to square the Universal Truths of Theosophy by the opinions of any persons whomsoever. Either a man finds sufficient evidence of them within himself and sown broadcast through the world, or he does not. In either case he need have no concern about persons.

2d. The reply is not quite as you state it "substantially." You have not seen through it; why should Arnold have done so, then? Read it again, and remember that the Beings there spoken of are not considered "men" in the East. It also appears that Arnold does not give his question just as it was put.

3d. We have no evidence that (*a*) Arnold correctly reported the reply, or (*b*) that he correctly understood it. This last is vital. It is difficult for the Western mind to understand or accept the attitude of the East in this regard. The Hindu is backed by centuries of silence and religious mystery. Occult laws, not to be here detailed, render it inadvisable for chela, initiate or believer to talk much with general outsiders upon such subjects. To put it briefly and crudely, they would engender inimical forces uselessly.

Again, the Hindu and Buddhist alike look upon these subjects with profound veneration, and upon the foreigner with profound suspicion. He has seen his holiest beliefs idly dissected and jestingly profaned—from his point of view. He then feels that he has "cast down his pearls" and brought dishonour upon them. Hence it is his habit to make an evasive or double-edged reply; sometimes it is a denial, but couched in a *significant* tone. In nine cases out of ten he finds the querist is only actuated by surface curiosity and accepts his answer without perceiving its disguised meaning. Then he rejoices that he has not desecrated his faith or bared his soul. But the earnest inquirer either catches the hidden spirit of the answer, or persists; that man gets satisfaction. He who is not ripe for the truth would not profit by it if it were told him, but would go away and gibe at so much as he did get.

Observe that Arnold did not persist, but accepted the answer. Did he take much interest in it? Would you have been put off so briefly in his place?

In conclusion, if you will test the fact yourself, you will find that you can make such an answer on almost any subject; and few will be the persons who take the trouble to get at your real meaning; appearances satisfy most men. Finding this, you, too, will test both.

"JULIUS."

But as the Buddhist priest has not himself written on this matter, it is well to hear all witnesses. In an article in the *Revue*

Belgique, by the Comte Goblet D'Alviella, and quoted in *The Theosophist* for March, 1885, (vol. 6, p. 137), the Count says:

"Those Arhats or Arahats (venerable men) are found in Tibet, and Col. Olcott says that what little of real Buddhism he knows he has learned from one of them. He also says that the *High Priest Sumangala told him* that only the adepts of the secret science *(Iddividhannana)* know the true nature of *Nirvana.*"

Now as it appears from Arnold's own report neither he nor Sumangala could know this science, it must follow that only those called Mahatmas (great souls) can know the science referred to by the priest in the above quotation. Furthermore, in all parts of India Mahatmas are admitted to exist; so much so that the word has passed into common use.

OCCULT ARTS*

NO. IV.

SOME PROPOSITIONS BY H. P. BLAVATSKY.[1]

THE following is extracted from H. P. B.'s first book, and is printed in this series with the belief that it will be useful as well as interesting. She gives some fundamental oriental propositions relating to occult arts, thus:

1. There is no miracle. Everything that happens is the result of law—eternal, immutable, ever-active. Apparent miracle is but the operation of forces antagonistic to what Dr. W. B. Carpenter, F. R. S.—a man of great learning but little knowledge—calls "the well ascertained laws of nature". Like many of his class, Dr. Carpenter ignores the fact that there may be laws once "known", now unknown, to science.

2. Nature is triune: there is a visible objective nature; an invisible, indwelling, energizing nature, the exact model of the other and its vital principle; and above these two is *spirit,* the source of all forces, alone eternal and indestructible. The lower two constantly change; the higher third does not.

3. Man is also triune: he has his objective physical body; his vitalizing astral body (or soul), the real man; and these two are brooded over and illuminated by the third—the sovereign, the immortal spirit. When the real man succeeds in merging himself with the latter, he becomes an immortal entity.

4. Magic, as a science, is the knowledge of these principles, and the way by which the omniscience and omnipotence of the spirit and its control over nature's forces may be acquired by the

*This article was first printed by Wm. Q. Judge in *The Path* for January, 1894.

[1] *Isis Unveiled,* Vol. ii, page 587, *et seq.*

individual while still in the body. Magic, as an art, is the application of this knowledge in practice.

5. Arcane knowledge misapplied is sorcery; beneficently used, true magic or wisdom.

6. Mediumship is the opposite of Adeptship; the medium is the passive instrument of foreign influences, the Adept actively controls himself and all inferior potencies.

7. All things that ever were, that are, or that will be, having their record upon the astral light, or tablet of the unseen universe, the initiated Adept, by using the vision of his own spirit, can know all that has been known or can be known.

8. Races of men differ in spiritual gifts as in color, stature, or any other external quality; among some people seership naturally prevails, among others mediumship. Some are addicted to sorcery, and transmit its secret rules of practice from generation to generation, with a range of psychical phenomena, more or less wide, as the result.

9. One phase of magical skill is the voluntary and conscious withdrawal of the inner man (astral form) from the outer man (physical body). In the cases of some mediums withdrawal occurs, but it is unconscious and involuntary. With the latter the body is more or less cataleptic at such times; but with the Adept the absence of the astral form would not be noticed, for the physical senses are alert and the individual appears only as though in a fit of abstraction—"a brown study", as some call it. To the movements of the wandering astral form neither time nor space offers any obstacle. The thaumaturgist thoroughly skilled in occult science can cause himself (that is, his physical body) to *seem* to disappear or to apparently take on any shape that he may choose. He may make his astral form visible, or he may give it protean appearances. In both cases these results will be achieved by a mesmeric hallucination simultaneously brought on. This hallucination is so perfect that the subject of it would stake his life that he saw a reality, when it is but a picture in his own mind impressed upon his consciousness by the irresistible will of the mesmeriser.

But while the astral form can go anywhere, penetrate any obstacle, and be seen at any distance from the physical body, the latter is dependent upon ordinary methods of transportation. It may be levitated under prescribed magnetic conditions, but not pass from one locality to another except in the usual way. Inert matter may be in certain cases and under certain conditions disintegrated, passed through walls and recombined, but living animal organisms cannot.

Arcane science teaches that the abandonment of the living body by the soul frequently occurs, and that we encounter every day in every condition of life such living corpses. Various causes, among them overpowering fright, grief, despair, a violent attack of sickness, or excessive sensuality, may bring this about. The vacant carcass may be entered and inhabited by the astral form of an

Adept, sorcerer, or an elementary (an earth-bound disembodied human soul), or, very very rarely, an elemental. Of course an Adept of white magic has the same power, but unless some very exceptional and great object is to be accomplished he will never consent to pollute himself by occupying the body of an impure person. In insanity the patient's astral being is either semi-paralyzed, bewildered, and subject to the influence of every passing spirit of any sort, or it has departed forever and the body is taken possession of by some vampirish entity near its own disintegration and clinging desperately to earth whose sensual pleasures it may enjoy for a brief season longer by this expedient.

10. The corner stone of magic is an intimate practical knowledge of magnetism and electricity, their qualities, correlations, and potencies. Especially necessary is a familiarity with their effects within and upon the animal kingdom and man. There are occult properties in many other minerals equally strange with that in the loadstone, which all practitioners of magic must know and of which so-called exact science is wholly ignorant. Plants also have like mystical properties in a most wonderful degree, and the secrets of the herbs of dreams and enchantments are only lost to European science, and, useless to say too, are unknown to it except in a few marked instances such as opium and hashish. Yet the psychical effects of even these few upon the human system are regarded as evidences of a temporary mental disorder.

To sum up all in a few words; Magic is spiritual wisdom; nature the material ally, pupil, and servant of the magician. One common vital principle pervades all things, and this is controllable by the perfected human will. The Adept can stimulate the movements of the natural forces in plants and animals in a preternatural degree. Such experiments are not obstructions of nature but quickenings; the conditions of intenser vital action are given.

The Adept can control the sensations and alter the conditions of the physical and astral bodies of other persons not Adepts; he can also govern and employ as he chooses the spirits of the elements. He cannot control the immortal spirit of any human being living or dead, for all such spirits are alike sparks of the Divine Essence and not subject to any foreign domination.

Propositions 2 and 3 contain and include the seven-fold classification. In 1877 H. P. B. was writing for those who had known but the three-fold scheme. In number two the vital principle (*prana* or *jiva*) is given; the body with vitality makes two; the real man inside called the soul, being composed of *astral body, desires,* and *mind,* makes five; the spirit, including the connecting link of *Buddhi,* completes the seven. The will is one of the forces directly from spirit, and is guided, with ordinary men, by desire; in the Adepts' case the will is guided by Buddhi, Manas, and Atma, including in its operation the force of a pure spiritual desire acting solely under law and duty.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

REMINISCENCES OF THE COUNT DE ST. GERMAIN*[1]

pp. 294. . . . As the name of the Count de St. Germain has slipped from my pen, I will say a few words about him. It was in 1743 the rumour spread that a foreigner, enormously rich, judging by the magnificence of his jewellery, had just arrived at Versailles. Where he came from, no one has ever been able to find out. His figure was well-knit and graceful, his hands delicate, his feet small, and the shapely legs enhanced by well-fitting silk stockings. His nether garments which fitted very closely, suggested a rare perfection of form; his smile showed magnificent teeth, a pretty dimple marked his chin, his hair was black, and his glance soft and penetrating. And oh, what eyes! . . . never have I seen their like. He looked about 40 or 45 years old. He was often to be met within the Royal private apartments, where he had unrestricted admission at the beginning of 1768. He never knew Mme. du Barri, but he was present at the time of the catastrophy of the Duchess de Châteaurouse.

When that lady died, the king, who had only known the Count de Saint Germain a year, yet had such confidence in him, that he asked him for an antidote for the dying Duchess. The Count refused saying—"It is too late."

I was blaming him one day for this answer, asserting that it is never too late to try and stop the effect of poison.

If I had cured the Duchess, he replied, I should have become responsible for all the violent deaths which may have happened since. Every family would have summoned me to perform a miracle, and it would have gone hard with me, had I failed in the enterprise. Such is man; somewhat egotistical.

"So are you too."

"That is just because I resemble them."

That old, everlasting Countess de Georgy, whom death must certainly have forgotten upon earth, said once to the Count, before me:—

"Fifty years ago, I was Ambassadress at Venice, and I remember seeing you there looking just as you do now, only somewhat riper in age, perhaps, for you have grown younger since then."

"I have always thought myself happy in being able to make myself agreeable to the ladies."

"You then called yourself Marquis Balletti."

"And Countess Georgy's memory is still as good as it was fifty years ago."

"That advantage I owe to an elixir you gave me at our first meeting. You are really an extraordinary man."

"Had this Marquis Balletti a bad reputation?"

"On the contrary, he was in very good society."

---

* This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Theosophist* for September, 1884.

[1] Translated from *"Souvenirs de Marie Antoinette, par Madame la Comtesse d'Adhemar"*—a rare work kindly lent to us by the Count and Countess d'Adhemar, descendants of the author of the *Souvenirs*—and both Fellows of the Theosophical Society of Paris: —Ed.

"Well! as no one complains of him, I adopt him willingly as my grandfather."

I know that subsequently his answers to Countess Georgy have been misrepresented; I record them, as I heard them fall from his mouth.

Count Saint Germain was very strange in everything. The Marquis de Valbelle on going to see him, finds him occupied at his furnace; he asks my husband to lend him a six franc piece: my husband takes one from his purse and gives it to the Count, who places it on a "matras" and covers it with a black substance; then with this apparatus he exposes it to the heat of the furnace. M. de Valbelle saw the piece change colour, turn red, and after some minutes, the adept took it out of the furnace, let it cool down, and returned it to the Marquis. The piece was no longer of silver, but of the purest gold; the transmutation was complete. I kept this piece till 1786, when it was stolen from me in my Secretary with several other foreign or old French coins.

M. de Saint Germain never asked others to eat with him, and he even did not receive visits at his own house. To see him, an appointment had to be made for a fixed day. But he often visited people of distinction who wished to see him. He had two valets de chambre; one who had been in his service for *500* years; the other, a thorough Parisian, knew the Court and the town.

Besides these, his household consisted of four lackeys, in snuff-coloured livery, with gold braiding. He hired a carriage at 500 francs a month. As he often changed his coats and waistcoats, he had a rich and extensive collection of them; but nothing approached the magnificence of his buttons, studs, watches, rings, chains, diamonds and other precious stones. Of these he possessed to a very large value and varied them almost every week.

He claimed to possess the secret of melting several diamonds into one, and he cleaned those that were defective, without sensibly lessening their weight. He repaired one which belonged to Louis XV and increased its value by 3,000 francs. I am not aware what became of this valuable collection at his death, which is thought to have occurred in 1784, in Sleswick, at the Court of the Elector of Hesse-Cassel; however the Count de Chalons, on his return from an embassy to Venice in 1788, told me that he had conversed with the Count de Saint Germain in the Square of Saint-Mark, the evening before he quitted Venice to go on an embassy to Portugal. I too saw him again.

One evening the Count was relating an anecdote in which, as usual, he pretended to have played the principal part; but not recollecting clearly all the details, he turned to his valet and said —am I not mistaken, Roger?

"Monsieur de Comte forgets that I have only been with him for 500 years; I could not, therefore, have been present at that occurrence; it must have been my predecessor."

From that time Roger always went by the name of "The 500 years." The conversation never languished where the Count de

Saint Germain was present; he animated it by relating numberless historical anecdotes; ghost stories, pictures of manners, choice and varied descriptions. Naturally reserved, he only seemed at ease in the very best company. He sat at table without even unfolding his napkin, for he never ate in public. But it was then especially that he amused us by his extraordinary stories. The last time we were together, he told us the following story.

In a northern city, which he did not name, a young nobleman of great promise, though of very loose habits, finding himself alone with one of his friends, confessed to him that he had so many mistresses that he could not endure women any longer.

And now, he added, to shake off this heaviness, I must have a supernatural creature, a sort of female vampire.

You are mad, said his friend.

Be it so, but none the less, I am going to-night to the cemetery to invoke the dead.

His companion shrugged his shoulders and left him. Count R... went at midnight to the cemetery of the town; he surrounded himself with a magic circle, and there, by horrible imprecations, strove to trouble the peace of the tomb. All remained in a death-like silence, but the Count heard, at some distance in the country, a woman's voice singing a rustic ballad. The ring of the voice was so pure, so harmonious, that M. de R.... forgetting the motive of his presence in the cemetery, left it, and ran to seek the person, whose voice had produced such an impression on him. It was a girl, young and beautiful; he accosts her, speaks with her, and insensibly guides her to the cemetery. Growing bolder, he tries to obtain favours, which she refuses him.

I can only belong to a husband, she says.

So be it, replied the Count, I marry you; there is my ring, give me yours in exchange, and we shall be engaged.

The proposition is accepted. Finding no further resistance, the Count remained until one o'clock in the morning in the company of the young girl. They then separated, promising to meet again the following night, at the same spot.

But the Count, having gratified his whim, at once forgot his promise, and her who was the object of it. So the following day, instead of going to the rendezvous, he very quietly went to bed. He had been asleep for an hour, when at midnight the door of his room opens.

Waking with a start, M. de R. hears the breathing of a human being, then the rustle of a dress. Some one slowly approaches his bed, the bed clothes are raised, and he feels slip in by his side, a body, soft and flexible, but cold as marble; and from which exhales a cadaverous odour.

The Count shudders; he tries to escape, but in vain . . . he tries to cry out, his voice expires on his trembling lips . . . an hour passes in this horrible torture, . . . at last the clock strikes, and his cold bed-fellow rises and disappears.

The next evening, to drive away the thought of that fatal night, the Count assembled round him a numerous society; the

most beautiful women of the town, a brilliant fete has been prepared, the rooms are hung with drapery and garlands, a multitude of candles, reflected in magnificent mirrors, make all surrounding articles sparkle; delicious music invites to dancing; the hours pass, and are forgotten. . . . M. R. alone counts each minute as it flies, awaiting midnight with anxiety.

Soon the twelve strokes resound, then . . . an Italian princess is announced; she has letters of recommendation for Count R.—; people rise, surround her, she is beautiful, and magnificently dressed. The Count grows frightfully pale, for, in this pretended princess, he has recognised the young girl of the cemetery, his sinister companion of the previous night. . . . The phantom approaches and fixes on him a glassy and immoveable gaze; everywhere this gaze pursues him, he cannot escape from it. At one o'clock the Italian princess rises, her servants are waiting and she must leave, and the prince breathes freely once more.

Each succeeding night, wherever the Count may be, he is followed by this fearful vision; his health becomes exhausted, he longs for death, for life has become hateful to him. He was on the point of death, continued Count Saint Germain, when chance led me into his neighbourhood. Perceiving in him a hidden sorrow, I questioned him; at first he hesitates, at length he reveals to me his secret. When he had finished speaking:—Thank God, I said, for having met me: at midnight I will return; watch and pray till that hour.

Count R. looked at me with an expression which pained; it was evident that all hope was dead in him. His hands, which I took, burnt mine. I spoke fresh words of consolation to pray, for his moral nature was more affected than the physical; then I left him to occupy myself with certain necessary preparation. At eleven I returned; he received me with delight, saying: "The fatal instant approaches. . . . " "Be calm, this night will put an end to your torments."

At a quarter to twelve I traced on the floor a solar triangle; I perfumed it, and then placed the Count in the middle, forbidding him to leave it whatever might happen. That done, I waited in silence. Midnight strikes, the door opens. . . . The room was lighted with seven candles, and I held in my hand the rod of Moses, of which one of his great grand-children made me a present at Babylon, during the reign of Cyrus. The door opens, and I see entering a form human in appearance, but inanimate in reality. From it exhaled a fetid odour, and I hastened to burn some incense. The spectre advanced towards the bed; but stopped at once, and then came in the direction of the Count as far as the limits of the triangle. Seeing that it could not pass them:—

"He is my husband," said the spectre, in a hollow voice.

"By fraud, for you did not give yourself to him as an inhabitant of the other world."

The phantom was silent; I touched it with the formidable rod, it shuddered, and its flesh putrified visibly.

"Restore the ring," I continued.

"Not here, but where I received it."

"Be it so, we will go there together; but you must precede us."

It disappeared.

I need not tell you what we saw when we had entered the cemetery, nor the combat I had to sustain; I was however victorious in it. The Count threw the ring on the tomb where he had sat with the phantom.

The spectre restored the one it had received, and then we were left alone.

It was late when we returned to the town. The following day, on awaking, a letter was handed me from the Count. On leaving me, instead of going home, he had gone and knocked at the door of a monastery, of which his ancestors had been benefactors. There he declared that he came to take the habit of a novice, and he died in the odour of sanctity 35 years afterwards. . . . Count Saint-Germain finished his letter here. Having thanked him for the fright he had caused us, we begged him to show us the rod of Moses. He began to laugh, and refused to satisfy our curiosity.

Another time, he told us, a charming woman attaches herself to his footsteps, she seems much in love with him, and writing him several letters, which he answers. One day she invites him to a masqued ball which she was going to give in a country-house aux Ternes. She adds that there would be a regular battle of luxury, and advises him to appear in all his magnificence. The Count puts on a certain apple-green coat, each button on which was a diamond worth 1,000 louis. The clasp on his hat had cost 300,000 francs, and the rest was in proportion. He pretends that he wore that evening more than 1,000,000 francs worth of jewels. Three lackeys stood behind his carriage, two on horse back lighted him, with torches. He arrives . . . and sees no sign of a fete. He asks the Swiss at the door whether Mme. d'Esnermenil is at home, and on an affirmative answer, he enters.

"What wind blows you here?" said that lady to him.

"I came to share in your fête."

"That takes place the day after tomorrow."

"You wrote to me that it would be to-day."

"You are mistaken."

"He then shows the invitation to Mme. d'Esnermenil."

"That is a mistake, said she, but no matter; since you are here, stay and sup with me."

"Shall you be alone?"

"Yes."

"I never eat except at home."

"But you drink, and I have some excellent currant syrup, which you must take."

A glass is brought, which I took mechanically in my left hand; the goblet touches a precious stone set in one of my rings, and

immediately bursts and is broken into a thousand pieces—the liquor which it contained was poisoned. Had I not known this property of my diamond, I should still have divined the poison by the stupefaction of the handsome widow.

So I seem to have fallen into a trap; how escape from it? . . .

I heard the noise of a carriage; it was mine which had been sent away. A lively waiting maid had come to tell my people that I would sleep at the house, and should expect them at 10 next morning. This I only learnt afterwards.

However, wishing to be sure that it really was my carriage which was leaving, I asked Madame d'Esnermenil what person was then leaving.

"A old relation of mine, she replied, who is returning to Paris."

I pretended to believe her; we went on chatting, but she was absent and preoccupied, and scarcely answered me. All at once, I hear a sound of steps, Madame d'Esnermenil grew pale and rose.

"Where are you going," said I.

"Some one is waiting for me. I shall be back in a moment.

"No, stay. I will it."

Then, with a sudden and powerful effort of will, I put her to sleep by placing my hand on her forehead. Then I asked her:

"You wanted to poison me?"

"Yes."

"And not having succeeded, you will have me assassinated?"

"Yes."

"Where are your people?"

"They are waiting till I pull the bell."

"How many are there?"

"Five."

"What is your object?"

"To steal your diamonds."

"You are a miserable wretch. Awake!"

She woke at once without any recollection of the revelation she had made in her sleep.

"I have been asleep, I think?" said she, smiling.

"One or two minutes."

"Will you permit me to call my women, as you are leaving."

"As you please."

She rang sharply. Five men armed with cutlasses rushed into the room; instantly I extended towards them my hand, in which I held a "philosophical pistol," pulled the trigger, the pistol went off, and the five rogues stood motionless and blinded. Then, covering with scorn the infamous widow, and enveloping myself with a protecting vapour, I hastened to abandon the den.

The next day, when the police, on my denunciation, went to arrest the brigands, they were found in the same situation, as was also their vile accomplice, none of them having been able to leave the spot. They were all hung.

THOUGHTS IN SOLITUDE*

VII.

THE HIGHER CARELESSNESS.

WHEN the mental vision has been searching with troubled and anxious gaze for some sure clue to the heavenward path, or when it has recoiled in horror before the picture of an effete civilization breaking up, and anarchy and violence taking the place of order, it is an intense relief to realize that there is an inner stronghold where the worn warrior may retire to, that there is a sure harbour where the storm tossed bark may find rest. And this harbour is ever at hand, this stronghold may be entered any moment. It requires but the conviction of its paramount necessity, it requires but the surrender—absolute and unconditional—of the man's lower nature to the other pole of his Being, and lo! he has attained a peace and a strength that the crumbling of the world in ruins at his feet could not shake. To be able to live in this state permanently is to have attained the condition of the Yogi or the Saint, but to have experienced it even for one moment teaches that it is the first step on the true spiritual path, which the mental vision might grope for through eternity without finding.

For one whose imagination can conjure up scenes of that human earthquake, a social revolution, where the impossibility of gauging the forces or of foreseeing the developments, adds so awfully to the horror of the situation, surely strength and courage must be the paramount qualities required, courage to keep the heart from fainting at the dread anticipation, and strength to keep the brain from reeling in the conflict.

But if the man has so fixed his soul on the Supreme soul, has so surrendered his will to the divine Will, has so identified himself with the Deity, that he feels he is but a tool in the omnipotent hand, the divine carelessness will have entered into him, and that will give him strength. There will be no looking forward with dread anticipation, for he cares not what happens to him—the duty that lies at his hand he will do with a clear brain and a steadfast will, caring not for the result though it may be danger and death—but what matters that? the flesh may quail at the final parting, but the man who has identified himself with the spirit within, which has inhabited many a house of flesh, has raised himself above mortal fears.

It is only in moments of supreme concentration and by intense imaginative power that we who toil on on lower levels can occasionally get a glimpse of this serene condition, which as far as words can describe it would seem to be portrayed in the second part of *Light on the Path* (Rule 8). "You can stand upright now, firm as a rock amid the turmoil, obeying the warrior who is thy self and thy king. Unconcerned in the battle save to do his bid-

*This article was first printed by Wm. Q. Judge in *The Path* for August, 1887.

ding, having no longer any care as to the result of the battle—for one thing only is important—that the warrior shall win; and you know he is incapable of defeat, standing thus, cool and awakened, use the hearing you have acquired by pain and by the destruction of pain, &c."

Even these who are still bound by the desires of action may occasionally reach in imagination the exalted serenity of this state of being, and such contemplation must doubtless help in freeing from the bondage of desire. Philanthropic work for Humanity will no longer seem an object for action, for the devotee will have become conscious that the Supreme Power that acts by him, is also guiding by invisible hands the whole course of human affairs, and the well-meant remedial actions of purblind men will, under the new illumination of the eternal light, appear to him in their true character as the ineffectual gropings of captives in a cavern. And the very fact of his no longer desiring to garner the fruit of his actions will cause his actions to be all the more far reaching in their results. The will becomes omnipotent when dissociated from human desire, for it is then part of the divine will.

His attitude towards Humanity will also find a parallel in his attitude towards Divinity, for the passionate adoration will have been left behind, and will have given place to the carelessness of the divine serenity.

The conquering of all earthly desires must be a work of ages, and many lessons will doubtless still remain to be learned by him who has attained to this state. It is written that the aspirant must always look forward with awe, and always be prepared for the battle, but in the vast scale of Being, great distance is lost in the infinite beyond, and from our present standpoint this higher carelessness would indeed seem to be the ultimate state realizable by man while still he bears the body, for what other is it than a foretaste while in the body of that "peace of God which passeth all understanding"?

PILGRIM.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONERS*

To Zadok.

Suppose persons have reason to believe they have found the beginning of the Way, and then find they do not care to investigate the mysteries of Occultism; that they are content to remain without knowledge on these subjects, though they found Truth through Theosophy, and that they are happy because they feel that whatever God orders in their lives must be right, whether it is pleasure or pain.

Suppose also that such persons, though having put themselves in a spiritually receptive condition, feel no weight of Karma, though

* This article was first printed by Wm. Q. Judge in *The Path* for March, 1888.

willing to suffer to whatever extent is needed from it. Do you not think such persons may be deceiving themselves in thinking they are Theosophists, when they have lived many weeks in this condition? Do you think it harder for women to attain spirituality than men? and if so, still should they not strive all the more to obtain it? I know we should not avoid anything merely because it is irksome or uninteresting.

Do not Theosophists allow themselves to feel happy if happiness comes to them without their desiring it? Also why do Theosophists wish to avoid feeling pain or pleasure, if God orders the circumstances which produce them, after we have subjected our will to His?

Please answer in your next issue of THE PATH. L.

Answer.—Men attach an erroneous meaning to Occultism. If one has found the beginning of *the Way* he has found some of the mysteries of Occultism, for none find *the Way* until they find something of the Unseen. It is impossible for one to put himself in a spiritually receptive condition without *"investigation"* of or being under the sway of Occultism or Occult conditions; and it is through these same conditions that he knows that pain and pleasure are one and all wise. Karma does not always manifest itself as suffering, by any means; it is quite as likely to produce joy as sorrow, and Karma is not always weighty. Such persons of whom you speak may be trying to become Theosophists, but are not Theosophists. A seeker for Divine wisdom seeks in all directions and refuses none.

2. It is as hard for man as for woman to enter the mysteries. Man works through the intellect, woman through the emotions or heart. Both are equally useless after a time, and of the two the heart is the better tool. But woman becomes engrossed or overwhelmed by her emotions, and passes no farther. The greatest Teachers have been those who have had most of the womanly in their natures. It is more difficult to master the body as a woman than as a man. This can be answered only partially in print.

3. The *True* Theosophist allows himself, or *is taught* to feel, both pain and pleasure, happiness and sorrow, for he knows them all to be wise. Men long for and desire; they fight for happiness and do not find it. We have given to us peace, which is far beyond happiness. Happiness is of this world and is a mockery of the True; yet as all other men we feel it, for we feel all things, for in all these things lie the lessons to be learned as men. I dare not speak for other men, but were I to wish to avoid either pleasure or pain, knowing them to be God's will, then would I utterly fail. Once having subjected *my* will—my human will—to His, then I avoid nothing that *is* His will.

ZADOK.

To Zadok.

1. Why, since the Deity chose of His own divine will to make the descent into matter, or—as some put it—by this process

alone came to Him a realizing sense of His being, in the manifestation through and by matter, why should this be considered a "*fall*," or, indeed, *an evil at all*, since, being the work and choice of the Deity, it must necessarily have been both wisdom and goodness which dictated the "descent;" and, as Theosophy teaches the inner Light and indwelling Emanuel (God with us) to be ever present in all forms of life, wherein consists the evil of this divine descent, and why must this *experience* be necessarily associated with evil at all?

2. I met an F. T. S. the other day who believes he has arrived at "Saintship" and cannot therefore err. He cannot bear the slightest contradiction, believing that he has arrived at such a state of "enlightenment" that he is infallible, whereas we less gifted mortals feel that he often makes grave mistakes. Of course this assumption is untenable in this case, but are sainthood and consequent infallibility likely to result from the humdrum every-day life of an ordinary nineteenth century man?

Answer.—For the Deity there is no fall. He can not fall. In the so-called descent into matter, He must manifest *through* something. Never does the Ineffable stand unveiled before mortal man. When the All Wise deemed it good to manifest Himself as individualities, He did so through the soul. After creating the human man with the soul that all things possess, "He breathed into his nostrils and man became a *living* soul," or the Deity manifested Himself through the soul in the man. Nothing below man is immortal. Man is not immortal; his soul is not immortal; but the breath of God, which is God's life or God himself, *is forever*. Man was to have lived as the angels, "for they also were made;" but, although by the grosser elements of matter or nature, by its lusts and desires, its seductive beauties and deceptive pleasures, realized most fully through the senses of the human body, the *soul* was drawn *down* instead of upward, into *ignorance* of *the true* instead of toward the wisdom of God, holding and binding thus the spirit in the meshes of the grossest part of nature, and so *fell*. God did not fall,—the spirit; nor did man as the human man; but the soul, being a free agent, did so, causing the spirit to be limited, and entailing pain and anguish upon the human man. Man with the Divine manifest in him was to know only the good, or wisdom; but, not content, he must eat of the *tree of the* KNOWLEDGE of good and evil, or the misapplication of the good, and *fell* into ignorance. There can be no greater evil than losing the wisdom of a God for the ignorance of a man. Herein consists the only evil of the *fall* after the descent into matter.

2. How do you know that he makes grave mistakes? I may not say that anyone errs or makes mistakes, other than my own self. Neither you or I may say another is saint or devil from our own standpoint of what makes either. Both you and I have been taught, however, that one who has arrived at the state of "Saintship" never lays claim to it or to "enlightenment."

Saintship and a certain measure of infallibility will result from humdrum every-day life in the nineteenth century, and in no other way, if rightly comprehended. Otherwise one would not be here at all, or would have lived in some other time, before time was. To become a saint one must know what sinners are and what sin is. The best way to arrive at this knowledge is through the nineteenth century or the time in which we live, through life and all it tells us. Believing that one cannot err and in one's infallibility is however not a characteristic of saintship.

ZADOK.

From Walter B.

1. What would be the effect if a sleeper, whose astral is abroad, were suddenly or violently awakened?

Answer.—The question is too general to be answered categorically. The effects vary in each case, and in the greater number only a powerful seer or adept could tell what, if any, effect had been produced. Further, several effects could be mentioned which would be incomprehensible to you unless you possessed actual experience in the matters referred to, for which no words of description exist as yet in the English language.

A person approaching to awaken a sleeper sends out the force of his thought at once long before he begins to awaken the person. That thought calls the attention of the sleeper's intelligence, and awakening has already begun before you have touched or spoken to him.

In general it is not well to suddenly awaken a sleeper. Yet thousands of cases are occurring daily where men in deep slumber are violently awakened with no bad results.

The matter inquired of, to be of profit, must be *experienced,* the sphere to which it relates not being one easily or usefully described.

2. Does the Astral body return in such case in time to avoid a calamity; and, if not, would the material bodily organism continue to perform its functions in a manner similar to a person in a hypnotic state?

Answer.—Partly answered in No. 1. Whenever the astral body *is* away it returns in time, in the greater number of cases. The material body is capable of performing many functions in an automatic way, so long as the real vital spark is not lost. As hypnotism is in its infancy both as to facts and terms, it is useless to compare anything to it: it would be better to refer to somnambulism for examples and comparison.

But in considering these questions you should be clear as to what you mean by "astral body," and as to whether it is a common fact that the generality of people have developed their potential astral body sufficiently for it to depart three inches from the material one. With most people, the astral body, when not closely interknit and working with the material body, is in a confused and nebulous state; hence it must be not common that it departs to any distance.

JULIUS.

ON THE LOOKOUT

Sir Oliver Lodge has contributed to *The Observer,* a London newspaper, a series of articles that will interest Theosophists, particularly those of a scientific turn of mind. "Part II—The Laws of Energy," appeared in the issue of February 6th. It is devoted to a consideration of the great apparent waste of energy in the material world, and asks what it is that has caused people to think that the whole cosmos, the entire material universe, is "running down into a state of inactivity which can only be stigmatized as death and stagnation? How can it be so, if energy is conserved?" The writer answers that, "Expenditure of energy, like expenditure of capital, is only transference or transformation, not destruction," and his conclusion is so logical and so in line with the teachings of Theosophy that we must quote it in full:—

"Meanwhile the successive expenditures" (of energy) "have served humanity. And so it is with expenditure and dissipation of energy! they may have served a human need, an intelligent purpose. That is the first way out of any difficulty we may have felt about a process apparently involving necessary waste—and it is by far the most important one—namely, that man is not limited to material activity alone, but is entitled to make use of it for mental and spiritual purposes, purposes with which physics has no concern and about which it has nothing to say. And in so far as mechanical energy runs down or runs to waste in the process it has fulfilled its destiny and served its higher purpose. Just as the legitimate wearing out of usefully working machinery, or indeed of human bodies too, in social service is abundantly justified.

"The life-period of a solar system, therefore, from its pristine nebula to its ultimate cold fate, may have been utilized in psychical and spiritual adventures of the utmost magnitude; and the gain to the universe as a whole, though not to the material universe, by reason of the possibilities afforded by the temporary existence of that material collocation may have been quite incalculable. Material decay may conduce to spiritual uplifting. That indeed appears to be the real object, the real purpose, even of the existence of matter and energy; and if either of them should run down in the process we need not repine."

That a Scientist of repute should publicly make a statement like the above is evidence of the tremendous influence that the ideas put forth as Theosophy are exercising upon the world. It gives to the Theosophist a growing confirmation of the prophetic utterance of H. P. Blavatsky to the effect that *The Secret Doctrine* would be the text-book of Science in the twentieth century. There is only one step further, scarcely that, between the ideas expressed in the above quotation and the statements by Wm. Q. Judge, in *The Ocean of Theosophy,* (Chap. VIII, pp. 60-61): "What then is the universe for, and for what final purpose is man the immortal thinker here in evolution? It is all for the experience and emancipation of the soul, for the purpose of raising the entire mass of manifested matter up to the stature, nature and dignity of conscious god-hood. The great aim is to reach self-consciousness . . . by and through the perfecting, after transformation, of the whole mass of matter as well as what we now call soul. Nothing is or is to be left out. The aim for present man is his initiation into complete knowledge, and for the other kingdoms below him that they may be raised up gradually from stage to stage to be in time initiated also. This is evolution carried to its highest point. . . ." Mr. Judge postulates a double evolution, physical and spiritual, showing that reincarnation, or re-embodiment is the process. Further, he quotes this statement, (*Ibid,* p. 134) first written by a Master, "Nature consciously prefers that matter should be indestructible in organic rather than inorganic forms, and works slowly but incessantly towards the

realization of this object—the evolution of conscious life out of inert material."

Sir Oliver Lodge, then, is merely re-echoing the ancient Wisdom-Religion when he writes, "Material decay may conduce to spiritual uplifting. That indeed appears to be the real object, the real purpose, even of the existence of matter and energy." Would it be pertinent to ask the titled Scientist, "Are you a student of *The Secret Doctrine?*" But let it pass. If only ideas theosophical may be known, seen to be true, and *utilized,* Theosophists will be content, whether the Teachers who sacrificed so much to bring them to the attention of the world are at present recognized and appreciated, or not.

Students of *The Secret Doctrine* will be interested in the following:

That the human race had its origin in the North Polar region is contended by W. H. Ballou, Sc. D., who writes as follows in the *Cleveland Plain Dealer:*

The fact that Stefansson, the renowned Arctic explorer, who had been unheard of for a year and a half, is still alive and courageously pursuing his research work in the Arctic regions, has revived the hope in scientific circles that before long he may return with the solution of some of the riddles of that vast area.

Although both the North Pole and the South Pole have been 'discovered,' it is nevertheless a fact that millions of square miles in both the Arctic and Antarctic have never been trodden on by modern man. The main object of the Stefansson expedition was to explore these unknown regions because they are believed to hold the answer to many questions which have long engaged the attention of scientific men.

One of these interesting questions was recently referred to by Prof. Henri Fournier of the Sorbonne. "When the work of polar research is so organized and systematized that scientists will be able to live at the North Pole the year round," he declared, "it will speedily be found that the birthplace of humanity, the traditional garden of Eden, was there. Life originated in the North Polar region, and spread from there throughout the world."

Had Prof. Fournier said that the manifestation of Life *began* on this planet in the North polar region, he would have found himself in accord with *The Secret Doctrine* to that extent. The conclusion, however, of the Professor and other men of science, that the first habitation of mankind was in the Polar regions, marks the beginning of a line of research that must finally upset all the presently held scientific theories in regard to the earth and its inhabitants, and bring about a fulfilment of the prophecy that by the twenty-first century *The Secret Doctrine* will have become the text-book of science.

In the Second Volume of *The Secret Doctrine,* published by H. P. Blavatsky in 1888, it is shown that there were Four great continents before this our Western one. The first was situated in the Arctic circle, and is said to be the cradle of the first Race. It is stated that this continent has never been submerged beneath the ocean, as has been, and will be, the fate of all other continents, but will remain from the beginning to the end of life on this planet. The Second Continent, named the Hyperborean, stretched out its promontories southward and westward from the North Pole to receive the Second Race, and comprised the whole of what is known now as Northern Asia. It was a real Continent, a land which knew no winter in those early days; nor have its sorry remains more than one night and day during the year even now. The Third Continent, called Lemuria, stretched from the Indian Ocean to Australia; it has now wholly disappeared beneath the waters of the Pacific, leaving here and there only some of its highland tops which are now islands. The Fourth Continent is named Atlantis, now for the most part beneath the At-

lantic Ocean. The Fifth great Continent includes Europe, Asia Minor and America.

The sequence of the great Continents shows the order of the evolution of the Races, from the First to the Fifth, our Aryan Root-Race. *The Secret Doctrine* takes no account of islands and peninsulas, nor does it follow the modern geographical distribution of land and sea. Since the day of its earliest teachings, and the destruction of the great Atlantis, the face of the earth has changed more than once through upheaval and submersion due to changes of the earth's axis.

If, as *The Secret Doctrine* states, there were four great Races of Mankind before our Aryan Root-Race, and our Root-Race sprang from a previous Race of which we have no historicial record, then the First Race on this earth must have had its genesis elsewhere, for conscious existence does not spring from matter. It is idle therefore to imagine that life *originated* on this planet, and modern science will be compelled to abandon that idea by its own discoveries; perforce it will come in time to accept the fact that the knowledge of all that has been still exists and may be found by any who are not wise in their own conceit.

The strong conviction which Prof. Stefansson holds in regard to the North Polar region may not be due to modern conjectures, nor to present geological and ethnological knowledge, but rather to an intuitive perception, the possession of which can only be explained by reincarnation. Should Prof. Stefansson be successful in his search, and find at the circle of the Arctic Pole a sea which never freezes and a continent which is ever green, modern theories about the age of Man will need much amending, in order to account for all that would arise from such a discovery.

"Go where thou wilt, to Benares or to Mathura; if thy soul is a stranger to thee, the whole world is unhomely."

This extract from *The Spirit of Man,* an anthology from the Philosophers and Poets, made by the Poet Laureate of England (Longman's), might serve as a motto for the book. The aim of the book as stated, is to collect together a multitude of witnesses to the belief that "man is a spiritual being, and the proper work of his mind is to interpret the world according to his higher nature, and to conquer the material aspects of the world so as to bring them into subjection to the spirit." And of all the poets and sages throughout remembered ages, who, think you, is the poet and sage quoted most freely by Mr. Bridges? (Shades of godly Orthodoxy and seemly Respectability tremble for your immortality!) It is no other than the "fiend writer," "the blaster of his race," "the demoniac proscriber of his species," the self-declared "atheist," Percy Bysshe Shelley.

It is exhilarating to think that had Shelley come in our day, it is possible we might, in a measure, have understood and appreciated him, so greatly have our literary ideals changed since he flared through an astonished and horrified world. It is interesting to note the evolution of Shelleyan criticism, for this denotes a change, not only of literary ideals, but of the ideals of life.

These extracts from critiques of Shelley's day are illustrative:

"The rhythm of the verse is often harsh and unmusical, the predominating character of Mr. Shelley's poetry is its frequent and total want of meaning. . . . Mr. Shelley's poetry is in sober sadness, drivelling prose run mad."—*Quarterly Review.*

"His private life has been a disgrace to humanity, and his poetry a blot on the literature."—*Blackwoods.*

". . . . dish of carrion, seasoned with sulphur as spice."

"To our apprehensions Prometheus is little else but absolute raving."—*Literary Gazette.* And so on ad nauseum.

Then there followed a period when the "fiend" idea was dropped. "Poor, poor, Shelley's poetry was admitted to be good, as such. But if only he had shared the prevailing and popular religious habits, if he had been content with the easy-chair attitude of those who possessed that desirable article, in regard to those who sat less comfortably, that it was God's will; had he been satisfied that his sole responsibility was to periodically confess himself to his Deity, a miserable sinner, and there let the matter drop, how much more comfortable we all should have been! Yes, his poetry turned out to be pretty good after all, but his philosophy was unspeakable! As a matter of fact there could be no poetry worthy the name that had not a sound philosophical basis. Mere rhyming metrical matter is not poetry and will not stand the acid test of time. The poetry that has endured has always been truth set to music, as it were.

It was at this time that Matthew Arnold talked about the "ineffectual angel beating in the void his luminous wings in vain." "Void" is a good word to use in regard to early nineteenth century phillistinism, and one dislikes making suggestions to the Superior Person, but how would "beating in the trough his luminous wings in vain" sound? Not so poetical but horribly true. If when the angel visited the pig-pen, the fortunate pigs were too preoccupied with their wash, and the unfortunate too engrossed in the effort to attain the desirable, to heed the visitor, would you place blame on the visitor or the visited? We know that when the wings appeared to be besmirched it was quite to the prevailing taste that the mire should be examined.

Leigh Hunt said of Shelley, "He was like a spirit that had darted out of its orb and found itself in another world. I used to tell him that he had come from the planet Mercury." Might it be that he was a fiery-tongued, brilliant Herald sent with a message to a sordid world, the message of Unity and Brotherhood? A Herald trampled and bruised by mob opinion, a forerunner of the Great Messengers who were to follow and establish these ideas into a cohesive force under the name of Theosophy? Shelley was ineffectual only to the static minds of his day. Now with the mould of our minds broken by the message brought in 1875, we can comprehend Shelley's plea for the perfectibility of man. A sacrilegious doctrine a century ago, to the professed followers of Jesus Christ, his testimony notwithstanding.

At the Shelley Centenary Mr. Edmund Gosse said these very significant words: "Whatever name he might give himself, he, more than any other poet of the age, saw God in everything." A reviewer of today (*London Times Literary Supplement*) says: ". . . he seems to hear the call of another world away from this one. He has a standard of comparison by which he measures this world and knows what in it is temporal and what eternal; and this standard of his seems not to have been attained by conjecture or straining after the unknown; rather this world is unknown to him, always shocking and surprising him by its irrational departure from that celestial form which was so securely established in his own mind. . . . He could think calmly because the world did not tie him down with its own standards and misgivings, its aimless hopes and fears. For him this life had always a meaning because it meant more than itself. . . . He was not a poet of England but of the universe; a patriot one might say, of that spiritual country for which his mind longed always."

So it seems that the writer of,

"To suffer woes which Hope thinks infinite;
To forgive wrongs darker than death or night;
To defy power, which seems omnipotent;
To love and bear; to hope till Hope creates
From its own wreck the thing it contemplates;
Neither to change; nor falter; nor repent;
This like thy glory, Titan, is to be
Good, great and joyous, beautiful and free;
This is alone Life, Joy, Empire, and Victory."

has at last come into his own, "and thus the whirligig of time brings in his revenges."

The serious question to ask ourselves seems to be, what are we doing? How are we treating the angels that may be beating their wings around us? Are we listening for their message, or are we wasting our time in a minute examination of the particular phase of matter in which they are involved? A comparison of the critiques of our day with those of a less enlightened time leads to the belief that we are not as concerned with personalities, in print, as heretofore, especially obnoxious personalities. We have ears, possibly, better attuned to listen for the beat of angels' wings. We would know how to take a confession of atheism from one who wrote,

O thou immortal deity
Whose throne is in the depth of human thought
I do adjure thy power and thee
By all that man may be, by all that he is not,
By all that he has been and yet must be!

Theosophical books and writings for children are a crying need of the day. This was just as true twenty or more years ago as it is now. William Q. Judge then directed attention to the lack of proper literature for children, the necessity of providing something; and some writings of a suitable nature were produced at that time, though not in such quantity as the situation demanded. It seems strange that in all the years since, no adequate children's books have been produced. Where are the Theosophical fathers and mothers, who know from intimate experience the workings of the youthful minds, the trend and scope of children's questions, and who should thus be the doers *par excellence* of this important work? It is true that some publications devoted to various expositions of "Theosophy" maintain departments for children, but for the most part the ideas and articles appearing in these are quite valueless—indeed, many are much worse than valueless because the writers themselves very evidently have no true conception of the Wisdom-Religion and thus cannot give to young minds a true direction. Many such articles are the veriest "twaddle," which fact is quickly recognized by the keen, inquiring youngster—and likewise by the parent who seeks wholesome theosophical food for the youthful mind, not the dubious, multicolored sweetmeats that can only interfere with mental health and increase credulity.

All this is apropos of little Janet and her grasp upon reincarnation. Janet is a very little girl and Janet's mother is a real Theosophist; so theosophical ideas have been explained to the youngster and her sisters, as simply as possible. The results show how possible and practical it is to inculcate fundamental truths, if sensible methods are pursued.

The children were playing together recently. All were happily engaged except Janet. It was noticed that she seemed to have no part in the fun but was standing at some distance and quite by herself.

"What is the matter, Janet?" she was asked. "Why aren't you playing with the rest?"

"Oh, I'm playing," she answered.

"You see, I'm going to reincarnate in a few minutes and be Mary's baby!"